

PRINCETON

DEC 18 1945

CG

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

OCTOBER 1945

Price 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS:

ARTICLES

- The 'Cities of Refuge', by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.
The Manual Acts in the Communion Office, by John C. Bowmer, B.D.
To the Mount—the Background of the Transfiguration, by Charles F. Davey, M.A., B.D.
Lucretius—a Tribute after Two Thousand Years, by W. Lamplough Doughty, B.A., B.D.
Das Christliche Dogma—Adolf Schlatter. (Translation by Margarete Steiner)
The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by John F. Humphrey, M.A., B.D.
San Francisco Charter, by Tadeusz B. Spitzer, LL.D.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

- Papias and the Elder John, by J. F. Brown, C.B.E., M.A., B.Sc.
And Can It Be!, by T. B. Shepherd, M.A., Ph.D.
Cambridge Forty Years Ago, by Charles Gimblett
Some Recent Children's Books and Books for Youth Workers, by James K. Whitehead, B.A.
The Mental Hospital Chaplain—his Work and Equipment, by Derrick Burke

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

MINISTERS IN COUNCIL, by William E. Farndale

RECENT LITERATURE—FROM MY NEW SHELF

Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

LONDON
EPWORTH PRESS
EDGAR C. BARTON
25-35 CITY ROAD E.C.1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller and from all Methodist ministers at 2s. 6d. a copy (postage 3d.) or 10s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.



GAS

FOR ALL COUNTRY HOMES
CHURCHES, BUILDINGS, ETC.

Delivered by road to over a quarter of a
million satisfied rural users

Write for FREE instruction Leaflet
CG/174

CHANGE TO

"CALOR" GAS



HEAD OFFICE: BELGROVE HOUSE, KING'S CROSS, W.C.1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

V
a
r
E

r
s
l
o
b
s
r
b
h
c
a
t
b
p

th
w
n
It
ce
be
It
In
ju
as
de
tw
At
19
ren

1
2
We
and
refe
Eng
8

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

OCTOBER 1945

THE 'CITIES OF REFUGE'

THE complete list of the six Hebrew 'cities of refuge' is first given in the Book of Joshua (xx. 7 f. P), but three are named and the other three presupposed in Deuteronomy (iv. 41-43; xix. 1-13), that is, at the time when the local sanctuaries were suppressed and the Temple at Jerusalem became the only shrine of the worship of Jahveh, at least in the Kingdom of Judah. It has been suggested, for instance, by G. Adam Smith¹ that the setting apart of the six cities followed on the centralization of the *cultus*, because, while the old right of asylum at *any* shrine would lapse except at Jerusalem, there would still be need for places where those who had committed accidental or justifiable homicide could take refuge. G. A. Smith also pointed out that the three cities chosen west of Jordan had long been three of the chief Hebrew shrines. In this article an attempt is made to investigate the subject more fully, particularly in the light of the customs of 'sanctuary' or 'asylum' in other parts of the world beside Palestine, for this seems to be a case where like causes might easily produce like effects. Some very widespread phenomena may first be mentioned.

In ancient and medieval times every shrine was a sanctuary. This meant that *everyone* who entered the 'holy ground', whether he were a fugitive or a worshipper, must 'keep the peace'. For instance, according to Doughty, a number of Arab tribes used to worship at Mecca even before Mohammed's time. It is obvious that there could be no worship at such a shrine unless all tribal feud ceased within the *haram* or sacred area. For many centuries the area at Mecca has been very large and the keeping of 'the peace of God' within it still continues. It follows that anyone who had committed a crime would flee there if he could. In other words, the right of asylum, both at Mecca and elsewhere, would be just a part of a wider custom. The right of refuge did not 'stand on its own feet', as it seems to have done in Israel *after* the abolition of the local shrines, but was derivative. Because the *haram* was safe for *everybody* it was safe for criminals. At two points there were variations. First, the *area* of sanctuary varied greatly.² At Hebron the present *haram*, which has long been enclosed with walls, measures 197 feet by 110.³ It seems that usually a fugitive would be safe as long as he remained within the *haram*, for the 'peace of God' was perpetual. Here, however,

¹ Cambridge Bible Commentary on Deuteronomy, p. 74.

² In mediæval England, for instance, it was usually confined to the church and graveyard, but at Westminster the 'close' too was sacrosanct, while at Beverley the holy ground stretched for a mile and a half or so in every direction from the Minster and included the whole town. For this and other references to English custom see J. Charles Cox, *Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers in Mediæval England*.

³ Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, art. 'Hebron'.

the second point to note intrudes. If a fugitive were to stay in sanctuary for life or for any long period he would need room to live. In other words, he would try to take refuge at a shrine where the *haram* was extensive. It would have been wellnigh impossible for a large number of man-slayers to live for long within the precincts of the 'high place' of an ordinary Hebrew village. Indeed, it is hard to see that they would be welcome there! In England there were variations in the period for which sanctuary was given. It was sometimes as short as seven days. By a custom peculiar to this country the criminal was then required by the sheriff to take a given highway to a given port, to reach this in a given time, and then to 'abjure the realm'. Yet there were places where a fugitive was safe *for life*, so long as he stayed within the sanctuary area. This was so, for instance, at Beverley and at St. Martin's le Grand in London, where the sacred area was large. Criminals fled to Beverley from many parts of the country. At St. Martin's, the City authorities kept a kind of court to examine all who wanted to enter the precincts! The penalties for breaking the peace of God, whether in pursuit of criminals or for any other reason, were sometimes very heavy. Eleanor Hull, in her *Folk-Lore of the British Isles*, says that, when the 'general assembly or open-air parliament' of Ireland met at Tara on Hallow-e'en, 'any man who committed violence or robbery or who struck another was put to death . . . even the king himself had not power to pardon him'. The population, therefore, of such sanctuaries as Beverley and St. Martin's must have been strangely mixed. In the reign of Richard the Second the sanctuary of St. Martin's was called 'a nest of corruption'. In 1540 Henry the Eighth set to work to reform the system of sanctuary throughout England. It was recognized that it was a widespread nuisance or worse. Among other things the king decided that there should be eight 'great sanctuaries', distributed in various parts of the country. Manchester was among them, but its citizens protested so strongly that this 'great sanctuary' was moved to Chester. There was strong protest here in turn, and the refugees were taken to Stafford.

Since fugitives would make for sanctuaries where they had room to live, the question emerges: 'Where would there be *large* sanctuaries?' Part of the answer is: 'Where there were tribal gatherings.' In Scandinavian areas, for instance, the places called Dingwall or Tynwald were once such centres. The relics of such a gathering may still be found in the annual assemblies at Tynwald Hill in the Isle of Man.¹ Tribal meetings were, of course, held in the open air, and, at least in the East, the place of meeting would not usually be inside towns, for the houses of towns crowded together and there were no large open spaces.² The sacred area at Mecca is necessarily large because of the multitudes who throng there. While there were other large sanctuaries in Israel, the *haram* must have been large in places where tribes gathered.

It was not only for common worship that gatherings were held at central sanctuaries. In the Isle of Man, while the proceedings at Tynwald Hill still open with an act of worship at a neighbouring church, there is also a rehearsal of the laws passed during the preceding year by the House of Keys in Douglas. At

¹ See Moore's *History of the Isle of Man*. On a visit to the island the writer was told that today at the beginning of the gathering there is first the marking of boundaries and then the proclamation of peace within it.

² In the Shetlands the gathering was held on an island in Tingwall Loch, see William Moffatt's *Shetland: the Isles of Nightless Summer*.

Tara, while 'a solemn religious sacrifice was offered to all the gods', 'the laws were also renewed and the annals and genealogies were written up'. This seems to imply that, as the tribesmen were unable to read and write, they needed to be reminded of the laws, and that a written copy was kept at Tara, no doubt by the priests. At Tara the assembly was held at Samhain because then the crops and fruits were ripe.¹ At some places those who had taken sanctuary were judged. For instance, in Shetland a man who had been found guilty of a crime by Tynwald was allowed to flee from the sacred island by the stepping-stones to the shore and make for a neighbouring church. He was pursued by a kinsman of the man he had wronged, but if he reached the church alive, he was safe. It looks as if such gatherings were the occasion for doing everything that the tribes did in common.

What evidence is there that any or all of these customs obtained in early Israel? There can be no doubt that every 'high place' was a sanctuary, though there is no evidence except for Jerusalem (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 28 ff.). The holiness of a 'high place' (which was outside the village — 1 Samuel ix. 14) would just be taken for granted and would not be mentioned unless there were special need. Its holiness is implied in the law, 'If a man come presumptuously upon his neighbour, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die' (Exodus xxi. 14, E), for this early law, on the usual dating, obtained before the abolition of the local sanctuaries. The law also illustrates a peculiarity in Hebrew practice, for among other races a criminal was safe at a sanctuary whether he were guilty or not. This was so as late as the Middle Ages. The story of Benaiah's execution of Joab does not quite fulfil the Hebrew law, for Benaiah did not 'take' Joab 'from the altar' but slew him at it. Yet the story does illustrate the sanctity of a shrine, for Benaiah first called on Joab to 'come forth' from 'the Tent', and only slew him at the altar on Solomon's express command. Joab had slain 'two men more righteous and better than he', and the story may show either that already Hebrew law denied sanctuary to a guilty man or that the compilers of Kings appealed to a later law to justify Solomon's act. There is no doubt that at two of the six 'cities of refuge', Hebron and Shechem, there were sanctuaries from very early times, for traditionally they were sacred places in Patriarchal days (Genesis xiii. 18, J; xxxiii. 20, E). The name of a third, Kedesh Naphtali, means 'the holy place of Naphtali'. There is no direct evidence for the three cities east of Jordan, but, apart from a story or two about Ramoth Gilead in the wars between Northern Israel and Aram, nothing at all is known about them.

Were there tribal gatherings at the six places in question in pre-Deuteronomic times? There is direct evidence for two of them. It was to Hebron that 'the men of Judah came and . . . anointed David king over the house of Judah' (2 Samuel ii. 4; cf. xv. 10). It is true that David was already there, but probably this was precisely because Hebron had long been the tribal centre for the Southern group of tribes, which in early days included other tribes beside Judah (Judges i. 10-20). There is clearer evidence that Shechem was the place where the central group, or 'Joseph tribes', gathered. While the story that Joshua gathered 'all the tribes of Israel to Shechem' for a valedictory address and for the renewal of the covenant (Joshua xxiv) is not likely to be historical,

¹ Eleanor Hull, *op. cit.*

it seems to show that Shechem was a place for tribal gatherings. Why else should a later writer place this gathering there? As Hebron was the place where the three Patriarchs were said to be buried, so Joseph's grave was shown at Shechem (Joshua xxiv. 32). Again, when the Ten Tribes, led by Ephraim, rebelled against Rehoboam, it was at Shechem that they gathered (1 Kings xii. 1). Here 'all Israel' means the Ten Tribes (verse 16). Shechem seems to have been the place where northern kings were crowned, the people playing their part (1 Kings xii. 1; cf. 2 Kings xi. 12; Judges ix. 6). There is perhaps a hint of evidence for Kedesh Naphtali also, for it was there that Barak 'called Zebulun and Naphtali together' (Judges iv. 10) to fight against Sisera. Indeed, when Deborah 'sent and called Barak the son of Abinoam out of Kedesh Naphtali', it may mean that she, as representing the central group of tribes (verse 5), appealed to Barak to rouse the assembly of the Northern group to join with 'Ephraim'.

There is indirect evidence that such tribal gatherings did take place, in a verse that is found both in document J and document E — 'Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord JHVH' (Exodus xxiii. 17; xxxiv. 23). After the centralization of the worship under Josiah the Southern tribes would meet at Jerusalem (Deuteronomy xvi. 16), but when the laws of J and E were made it is unlikely that all the twelve tribes met at one spot, if only because distance would not allow of such a universal journey. Again, the law could hardly mean that 'all the males' of each *village* were to gather at the *local* 'high place', for, if this were so, there seems to be no reason why attendance should only be demanded from 'males'. Further, in J, the words are added, 'For I will cast out nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou goest up to appear before JHVH thy God three times in the year' (Exodus xxxiv. 24). This seems to imply that, when a man 'went up' to keep one of the three feasts, there was some danger that another might seize his land during his absence — that is, that the shrine to which he went was at a distance. In the story of Shiloh in the Book of Judges (xxi. 16 ff.), there is perhaps evidence that the *Canaanites* kept these feasts at the *local* sanctuaries, even though the phrase 'the feast of JHVH' occurs, for this story was probably worked over by a later editor who would think of Shiloh as one of His sanctuaries. It is very likely, as often suggested, that the Hebrews took over the three annual Feasts from the Canaanites, for they are feasts of harvest and suit an agricultural rather than a nomadic people, but most, or even all, of the other laws in the code found in Exodus xxxiv are protests against Canaanite customs. For instance, the Ras Shamra documents show that 'seething a kid in its mother's milk' was a mark of the worship of 'the inhabitants of the land'. May it not then be that there was a distinctively Hebrew custom about the three Feasts, which lay, not in the keeping of them, but in the keeping of them *at a central shrine*? What places are so likely for the West of Jordan as Hebron, Shechem, and Kedesh, since, as already seen, there is some direct evidence that the three Western groups of tribes used to gather there? So far as the East of Jordan is concerned, it seems likely that because of the distances involved, each of the three tribes of Reuben, Gad, and (half) Manasseh had its own central sanctuary. Only the site of one of them, Ramoth Gilead, is known, and this would suit quite well as the central shrine for the tribe of Gad. It will

be s
to v
exa
with
A
stor
trek
is un
num
buil
the
This
whet
asser
Cave
'befo
Tw
of m
the n
'cong
group
Then
rema
was
prese
out b
— say
woul
the fi
execu
period
dispu
priest
'senio
'acce
and i
have
after
live w
old ru
Bot
the 'ci
and x
forty-t
former
except

¹ In n
with pil

be seen that on this showing the practice of meeting at a central shrine had not to wait till Josiah's reformation. Outside Israel there are, of course, many examples of worship *both* at leading shrines *and* at local sanctuaries. India teems with both customs.¹

As elsewhere, the tribal gatherings in Israel would be *outside* a 'city'. In the story of the migration of the Danites in Judges we are told that six hundred men trekked to the north, and Dan was one of the smaller tribes. Even if the number is un-historical it is plain that, when the story took shape, there might be such a number of 'males' in a single tribe. There would be no area, let alone any building, *inside* a 'city' where such a company could conveniently gather. Even the 'elders' of a single 'city' 'sat in the gate' when they did the village business. This requires that there was an open space near the 'gate', but it is not clear whether it was inside the 'city' or outside. Would it be big enough for a tribal assembly? Probably the gathering of the Southern tribes was held near the Cave of Machpelah, and we have evidence that it lay in a 'field' that was 'before Mamre' (Genesis xxiii).

Two regulations in the Priestly Documents (Numbers xxxv) may be relics of more ancient custom. It is stated that 'the congregation' is to decide between the man-slayer and the 'avenger of blood', but there is no account of how the 'congregation' was to be gathered or where. In earlier days the gathering of a group of tribes at the *haram* would provide both time and place and 'jury'. Then there is the rule that the 'unwitting' or 'unwilling' man-slayer should remain in the 'city of refuge' until 'the death of the high priest'. The refugee was not to be a refugee for life. As elsewhere, the number of refugees would present a problem, if only because of their number, and Israel found the way out by making 'sanctuary' temporary. But what should end it? To fix a period, — say, five years — seems to us the obvious way, but in a Hebrew village there would be no registrar of time. If a man-slayer returned when *he* reckoned that the fixed period was over, the avenger might dispute the reckoning — or even execute 'Jeddart justice', killing his man first and abiding investigation of period afterwards! What was wanted was a well-known *event* that no one could dispute. At the sanctuaries there would almost certainly be a leading or 'chief priest', such as Eli at Shiloh or Zadok at Jerusalem, who would normally be a 'senior man'. When he died — and with senior men the interval after his 'accession' would not usually be very long — his death would become common and indisputable knowledge when next the group of tribes met. It may even have been that a fugitive returned to his village with its contingent of 'males' after the Festival at which the chief priest's death was announced. His right to live would then be indisputable. When Josiah closed the other sanctuaries the old rule, on this showing, was transferred to the High Priest at Jerusalem.

Both in Numbers and Joshua the Priestly documents connect the account of the 'cities of refuge' with 'the cities of the Priests' (Numbers xxxv; Joshua xx and xxi). In Numbers the six 'cities of refuge' are given pre-eminence over the forty-two other priestly cities (Numbers xxxv. 6), while in Joshua five of the former, named as 'cities of refuge', head five of the groups of the latter. The exception is Bazer (Joshua xxi. 36), but the passage in question is wanting in

¹ In medieval times the dual practice was rife in Christendom, as the use of local churches along with pilgrimage to Jerusalem, Rome, Compostella, Canterbury, and so on, abundantly show.

the Massoretic text, being included in the English versions from other Hebrew documents, and the LXX supplies the missing phrase. The answer to the question 'What happened to the priests at the "high places" when worship was centralized at Jerusalem?' is a difficult and complex one, but it looks as if there had long been large groups of priests at the six 'cities of refuge' whose status was ultimately recognized and who secured the right to serve in the Temple at Jerusalem. This seems more likely than that large numbers of the priests at Jerusalem spread to just these cities either in the period after Josiah or in post-Exilic times. It is likely that worship would continue, in spite of Josiah, at all the 'cities of refuge' except Hebron, for they were beyond his reach. There is no reason to suppose that either the Assyrian or the Babylonian captivity put an end to it. It may be added that even the Priestly document says that the 'cities of refuge' were 'sanctified' (Joshua xx. 7). It looks as if the *haram* at each of the forty-eight places, whether it were large or small, became the priests' property when their shrines were closed.

It has already been suggested that the tribal groups did not confine themselves to worship when they gathered for the Festivals. If they did as other peoples did, these assemblies would be the occasion for the rehearsal and making of laws. The account of the gathering at Shechem at the close of the story of Joshua (Joshua xxiv), whether it is wholly or partly historical or not, implies that there was a written record there called 'the book of the law of God' (verse 26), and perhaps that it was sometimes read at assemblies. It is at least possible that document J belongs to Hebron and document E to Shechem — and, if there is anything in the suggestion that Deuteronomy includes elements of Northern origin, for them Kedesh would be an alternative *locale* to Dan. The laws in Exodus xxi-xxiii look like a series that had grown up haphazard, and some of them (e.g. Exodus xxi. 2-6) seem to be the more exact definition of earlier customs. If the code grew gradually at Shechem, as occasion required, this would account for these phenomena. Again, the Festival gatherings would be the natural occasion for the settling of disputes to which the 'elders in the gate' of a village were unequal — particularly disputes between two villages. Such a custom may lie behind the late story of the gathering of 'all the children of Israel' to judge Benjamin because of the outrage of Gibeah (Judges xix, xxi). Finally, in Israel as elsewhere, the Festival gatherings may have been the occasions when a group of tribes, after discussion, 'sanctified' or declared aggressive war (cf. Jeremiah vi. 4, etc.). Aggressive wars, however, were rare in Israel between the days of Joshua and David, and, of course, the custom could hardly be followed when Israel itself, or a part of it, was attacked by others. There is no need to argue that in all this the priests of the shrine would play a large part. In particular, they would order and lead the worship, and they would keep and read 'the book of the law', adding the new laws to the written record from time to time, as the Zadokite priests probably did at Jerusalem. It was doubtless there that J and E were united and that the laws of Deuteronomy grew to their final form.

When 'there was a king in Israel', what was his attitude to the old assemblies of the groups of tribes? Such sagacious kings as David and Jeroboam I, who owed their thrones to 'popular election', would make no attempt to suppress them. What would suppression have meant in the administration of

lay
wi
pa
th
'ju
wh
dis
kin
wil
cee
wa
sun
boa
at
the
Da
(Ar
peop
wor
i K
boa
Sol
reve
an
(i K
It v
cour
reco
decl
eigh
T
tent
Both
call
tion
Jaco
(Ger
tang
mun
did
quer
Dina
burie

¹ N
the ro
of He
² So
and so
both t

law in disputes between villages?¹ Founders of dynasties have not usually begun with logical arrangements. Rather, they have been the ultimate arbiters in particular disputes, as the twin stories of Nathan's 'parable' and the appeal of the Woman of Tekoa show for Israel. These two imaginary stories show how a 'just' king was 'the protector of the poor', for a king had a bodyguard through which he could *enforce* a decision. The author of Judges, in his two stories of disorder (Judges xvii.-xxi), has the tell-tale phrase, 'In those days there was no king in Israel'. What would happen would be that, as the kings enforced their will, the *political* power of the local gatherings and even the need for legal proceedings at them would lessen and lessen. In Scandinavian countries the Tynwald gatherings ultimately died by desuetude, except for the picturesque Manx survival, which none the less illustrates desuetude. Probably, however, Jeroboam also attacked the local assemblies indirectly. He knew that the gathering at Shechem had made him king — might it not make another king? When, therefore, he selected sites for his two great sanctuaries, he chose Bethel and Dan, not Shechem and Kedesh. The splendour of the two 'king's sanctuaries' (Amos vii. 13) would draw away worshippers from the ancient shrines of the people. Pilgrimage to Bethel and Dan, which were also old Hebrew shrines, would increase, and pilgrimage to Shechem and Kedesh decrease. In spite of 1 Kings xii. 26 ff. the popular gatherings would be far more dangerous to Jeroboam than the new Temple at Jerusalem, for it was against the task-work that Solomon had laid upon the Ten Tribes in his magnificent buildings that they revolted. The Temple, which was one of those buildings and besides was not an ancient shrine, would not be very attractive. But Jeroboam fortified Shechem (1 Kings xii. 25) to watch the dangerous gathering that was held just outside it.² It will be seen that all this means that the cities later called 'cities of refuge' counted for far more in the pre-monarchic history of Israel than has usually been recognized. Under the monarchy, however, their importance would gradually decline until the three Festivals were nothing more than religious feasts. In the eighth century there were still priests at Shechem (Hosea vi. 9).

The stories of Abraham and Jacob show that these nomads might pitch their tents near a 'city' (Genesis xviii. 1; xxxiii. 18), as nomads sometimes do today. Both Patriarchs bought a 'parcel of ground' near one of the cities that were later called 'cities of refuge' (Genesis xxiii; xxxiii. 19). This seems to be the traditional account of the origin of the sacred places at two of the central shrines. Jacob is specifically said to have 'built an altar' on the ground that he bought (Genesis xxxiii. 20; cf. xii. 7). The story of Dinah follows this passage. It is a tangled story, but it plainly requires that the Canaanite and Hebrew communities were separate. Again, Jacob's flight from Shechem (Genesis xxxv. 1-5) did not mean that the Hebrews left it permanently, for Jacob's sons subsequently fed their flocks there (Genesis xxxvii. 12-14), and indeed the story of Dinah itself gives a hint that Jacob and his folk expected to return, for they buried 'the strange gods that were in their hand . . . under the terebinth by

¹ Norman kings made no attempt to suppress the old local 'law-courts' of Saxon times. Rather, the royal authority was superimposed, however illogically, upon them, and it was not until the reign of Henry II that there was any systematic correlation between the local 'courts' and the king's rule.

² So William the Conqueror built the Tower, nominally to protect London, but also to watch it, and so in the nineteenth century the British fixed cantonments at Secunderabad and Bangalore — both to assist and watch the Nizam and the Maharajah.

Shechem'. They would hardly have done this unless, like the man who buried the 'treasure hid in a field', they had looked to recover them. If the Hebrew 'parcel of ground' were outside Shechem, is it not likely to have lain round Jacob's Well? This would suit the story of Abimelech and Shechem in Judges. There two communities, 'all the men of Shechem' and 'all the house of the millo', are said to have 'made Abimelech king by the terebinth of the pillar that was in (ג) Shechem'. The Oxford Hebrew Lexicon admits 'near' as a rare meaning of ג, but it is likely enough that 'Shechem' here means the city and its fields. There is evidence that kings were proclaimed near water (1 Kings i. 38), perhaps because a sacred bath was part of the ceremonies. Did Abimelech bathe in water from Jacob's Well? The phrase 'all the house of the millo' suggests that there was some kind of fortress near the Well, perhaps like those today at some of the wells on the road from Damascus to Medina and Mecca. Recent excavation has uncovered the ruins of a 'tower' and other buildings half a mile from the Well on the road to Shechem. When later Abimelech had captured the Canaanite city, the 'men of the tower of Shechem', who may probably be identified with 'all the house of the millo', took refuge in 'the cave (not 'hold') of the house of El-berith'. There is no cave at Jacob's Well, but there are many not far away — for instance, 'the traditional sepulchres of Eleasar and Phineas' and 'a cave reputed to have been the residence of Elijah.' There is no reason why one of these should not have been connected with the shrine at the Well. At Nasik in India, for instance, Sita's Cave, one of the most sacred of the holy places, lies quite a long way from the city; similarly, Arafat is three hours' journey from Mecca. Abimelech took the ancient way with enemies in a cave — he lit a great fire at its mouth and smothered them. The whole story fits in with the suggestion that in the time of the Judges there was a Canaanite community within the walls of Shechem and a Hebrew community, with a millo, near Jacob's Well. There would be a resident community at the tribal centres for these would not be deserted between the dates of the three great Feasts. There was a store of treasure in the 'house of Baal-berith' (Judges ix. 4); this illustrates the very widespread custom by which sanctuaries were used as banks.

C. RYDER SMITH

THE MANUAL ACTS IN THE COMMUNION OFFICE

THE Order of Service for Holy Communion as it is authorized for British Methodism in the *Book of Offices* (1936) is unique among the liturgies of those Churches which have retained the traditional or Catholic 'shape' of the Communion Office, in that it contains no reference to the Manual Acts. By the Manual Acts we mean those instructions to the minister to take the paten and cup in his hands and to break the bread during the words of Institution. We will confine ourselves to the five rubrics as they appear in the last Methodist Service Book to contain them, *The Sunday Service of the Methodists* (1878), viz.:

¹ *Vacation Tourists*, ed. by Francis Galton, p. 348.

who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread (a); and when he had given thanks he break it (b), and gave it to his disciples saying, Take, eat; this (c) is my body which is given for you . . . Likewise after supper, he took (d) the cup . . . saying, Drink ye all of this, for this (e) is my blood.

- (a) *Here the minister is to take the paten into his hands*
 (b) *and here to break the bread*
 (c) *and here to lay his hand upon all the bread*
 (d) *here he is to take the cup in his hand*
 (e) *and here to lay his hand upon the cup*

As these simple but suggestive actions have been retained by the chief representatives of both Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of Western Christendom, one might be expected to ask why has Methodism, with her heritage of the Anglican Liturgy, seen fit to excise them from her service? When we remember that the omission was not made by John Wesley, nor did it come till one hundred years after his death, the question becomes all the more interesting. The question can be stated, 'Why did the mother Church of Methodism, the ex-Wesleyan, in 1881, or thereabouts, break with the practice of the Eastern and the Western Church and no longer ask its ministers to break the bread and take the cup when conducting the Communion Service?' Several subsidiary questions also come to mind. Was the omission deliberate and intentional? Was it for theological or anti-ceremonial reasons? Was it due to prejudice or ignorance? Did the Conference ever sanction it? Was it justified? These are questions more easily asked than answered, yet an attempt may be made to investigate some of them.

Historically, the Manual Acts are well attested and scriptural antecedents can legitimately be claimed for them. The words of the Master, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, 'this do', seem naturally to refer to the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup. Two cups are mentioned in Luke xxii. 14 ff., but it seems that the second is the Institutional cup and the first is part of the grace before the meal. Pauline mention of the action is found in 1 Corinthians x. 16; 'the cup of blessing which we bless . . . the bread which we break' evidently refer to the presiding minister — celebrant or bishop or whatever he may be called. Had the reference been to the common actions of the congregation we might have expected Paul to have written, 'the cup of blessing that we drink . . . the bread that we eat . . .' The plurals *εὐλογοῦμεν* and *κλάμεν* do not necessarily mean that the whole congregation took part in saying the benediction or thanksgiving or in breaking the bread, except so far as the minister represented the whole body.' (I.C.C. p. 212).

If traced even farther back, these actions may be found to have antecedents in Jewish sacramental meals, though it must be remembered that the Jews did not bless the food, but rather blessed God for the food,

Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who createst the fruit of the vine.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth,

for without such a blessing they would not eat. Be that as it may, Christian

circles, both Jewish and Gentile, took these actions, baptized them into Him who gave them, charged them with a distinctive Christian meaning and made them a feature of their Eucharistic service. It was St. Chrysostom who observed, commenting on Matthew xxvi, 'see how He weans and draws them from Jewish rites' (quoted by Blunt: *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*). The fact that the service came to be known as 'The Breaking of Bread' suggests that some prominence was given to this particular feature.

These actions thus passed into the main stream of Eucharistic practice, gathering round them much ceremony and interpreted with much ingenuity. In the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, for instance, the particles of the fractured Host were arranged as a cruciform figure made up of seven or nine pieces, each with a particular designation corresponding to some mystery in the life of Christ. In the East, the fraction of the bread was always a highly elaborate ceremony. In the medieval Roman Church, however, the Manual Acts were somewhat overshadowed in significance by the elevation of the Host which came to be regarded with superstitious awe.

From the Roman rite the Manual Acts passed into the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, the immediate ancestor of our own office. Though there were no definite instructions for their performance until the 1662 edition, the 1549 edition simply instructed the priest to take the bread and the cup into his hands. These were omitted at the 1552 revision, but restored in 1661. This restoration, it is interesting to note, is one of the seventeen concessions made by the bishops in reply to Baxter's Savoy Liturgy, which itself was a compromise between Anglican and Genevan rites. Thus the presence of the Manual Acts in the *Book of Common Prayer* owes something to the efforts of the Puritan party who demanded that they be done 'in the sight of the people'. The words were modified to 'before the people' by the revisers of 1661. The Puritans were, in this, at one with Calvin and Knox, who retained the Manual Acts performed by the minister standing *behind* the table. This, the Basilican posture as it is called, was regarded as more primitive and more true to the idea of Justin Martyr's *προεστώς* (President) — 'a president does not usually turn his back upon those over whom he is presiding' (Maxwell: *John Knox's Genevan Service Book*, p. 47). From the rites of Calvin and Knox, Presbyterian practices are derived and in them we find the Manual Acts playing an integral part; in number, however, they are reduced to three, corresponding to (a), (b), and (d) of those cited above. At the same time the Eastern custom is adopted whereby the Manual Acts are not embedded in the Prayer of Consecration, but constitute a separate action during the Narrative of Institution read by the Minister.

To return, however, to the Anglican and Methodist procedure — from the Anglican rite, of which John Wesley says, 'I believe there is no Liturgy in the world, either in ancient or modern languages, which breathes a more solid, scriptural, rational piety' (Preface to *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in U.S.A.*), the Manual Acts passed into Methodism via Wesley's Revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*. There is not space, nor is it relevant to our purpose, to delineate the characteristics of the successive Service Books of Methodism, but the following can be cited as the chief editions:

1. In 1784 John Wesley issued his *Sunday Service of the Methodists in U.S.A.*, in which (to quote from his own Preface):
 - (a) Most of the holy-days (so called) are omitted . . .
 - (b) The Service of the Lord's Day . . . is considerably shortened,
 - (c) Some sentences in the offices of Baptism and for the Burial of the Dead are omitted, and
 - (d) Many Psalms are left out. . . .
 No mention is made of the Communion Service. It was certainly revised, but the Manual Acts remained.
2. In 1786 this book was re-issued as *The Sunday Service of the Methodists in His Majesty's Dominions*, with alterations only as they affected the Royal Family.
3. In 1788 *The Sunday Service of the Methodists with other Occasional Services* appeared still retaining the Manual Acts and this was in use in British Methodism until 1881.

Then came the crucial edition of 1882 or thereabouts. Whatever other modifications might have been made, we are here concerned only to note that the Manual Acts were dropped. Why they were dropped is difficult to say. There was at the time an anti-Anglican movement led by Dr. J. H. Rigg which aimed at amending the Baptismal Service and removing traces of Anglican influence in the rest of the Service Book. There was alarm in some quarters at the supposed danger of Anglo-Catholic tendencies creeping into Wesleyan Methodism. In any case, several left-wing tendencies revealed themselves and the net result was that the Baptism service was amended, the Manual Acts dropped from the Communion Service and three Ministerial brethren seceded from the Connexion.

Thus, from 1881 to the present day, the official service of the Methodist Church has been, and now is, without the Manual Acts. This is not to say that they never are performed. In fact, those who do perform them may even claim to be within the constitution of Methodism, when it is recalled that the *Book of Common Prayer* was a legitimate alternative to Wesley's Revision and remains so to our present *Book of Offices*. Nothing since Union has been done to rescind its use as an alternative. Apart from this anti-Anglo-Catholic tendency which was abroad during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, it is difficult to discover any real reason to account for the omission of the Manual Acts; nor is this a particularly cogent reason for dropping so summarily a custom dear even to Puritans and Presbyterians. There is only one other suggestion which one might venture to offer to account for the loss — that is, that they might have been omitted, intentionally or inadvertently, by some Book Steward or other without the sanction of Conference. We cannot tell.

When we come to ask, 'Was the omission justified?' we move no longer in the realm of historical facts, but amid opinions and preferences. There are always those who are apprehensive of anything which might even loosely be styled 'ritual', 'materialistic', and so forth. They would banish from our worship all ceremonial except a bare minimum necessary for order. Again, there are always the uninformed and biased 'anti-Anglican' who will not countenance anything which they call 'churchy'. In the opposite camp, but equally incorrigible, are

the traditionalists, the die-hards, for whom a practice has simply to bear the hallmark of Rome or Canterbury and it is accepted as genuine without demur. These three types will alike all have made up their minds, one way or the other, about Manual Acts, and it would be futile to debate with them; but for those who are willing to consider a case on its merits, reasonable objections may be met and an argument put forward for the re-instatement of the Manual Acts into a worthy place in our service of Holy Communion.

It is sometimes contended that the Manual Acts, performed during the Prayer of Consecration, when the people are in the attitude of prayer with eyes closed, can mean nothing to the worshippers. This is a serious contention and arises partly from the regrettable position of the Words of Institution and with them the Manual Acts in the Anglican and Methodist rites. The position is this:

1. *The Book of Common Prayer* places the Manual Acts within the prayer of Consecration. The structure and atmosphere of this office are Catholic rather than Reformed. The background of belief is that something is done to the elements by the words of an episcopally ordained priest and by the imposition of his hands — call this 'something' transubstantiation or what you will. Technically, consecration was held to be effected by the Epiclesis in the East and by the recital of the words 'Hoc est corpus meum' in the West, but in practice, the Manual Acts were not dissociate from the idea of consecration. In any case, the actions of the priest are performed and are efficacious whether the people see them or not; if the eyes of the worshippers are closed in prayer they do not, of course, see what the priest is doing. At the same time, we must not take the closed eyes for granted for Dr. Percy Dearmer points out (see his *Parson's Handbook*, p. 339) that the Lincoln Judgement requires that they be done with some degree of prominence for 'if any ceremonial is to be visible to the people, that action of Christ's unquestionably ought to be so'. Dr. Dearmer also confirms what we said above, that it was the Puritans who, in 1661, pressed for the wording of the rubric 'in the sight of all the people'. The position of the Manual Acts within the Prayer of Consecration is one of the anomalies of the Anglican rite which is rectified in the Reformed Liturgies.

2. *The Presbyterians* rejected the idea that something was done to the elements by the imposition of priestly hands or the recitation of specified words, and altered the service so that the Words of Institution, with three of the Manual Acts did not occur within a prayer but were read by the Minister. This can be seen in any Presbyterian Order of Service, e.g. the *Scottish Book of Common Order*. Here the background of belief is not the magic of the priestly touch, but that the minister, standing behind the table, presents a re-enactment of the drama of the Upper Room. We cannot assume that the people will be in the posture of prayer, with or without eyes closed; on the contrary, it is natural to suppose that they will be watching the minister. In this way the Presbyterians have been able both to retain the Manual Acts without suggesting Transubstantiation and to rectify a liturgical error of the *Book of Common Prayer*. It is interesting to note that a parallel to the Reformed Order of Service is to be found in the Methodist Alternative Order in which the Narrative of Institution is read by the minister and is not contained within a prayer.

This is not to close the question that they are pointless within a prayer. It is

sometimes to be wondered whether the significance of closed eyes is not over-rated. Is prayer any less real when said kneeling with eyes open watching the minister, or, in private devotions, with eyes fixed on some sacred object? Is it any less real than when it is uttered in the 'non-conformist crouch'? Our peril is that of overrating the subjective element in sacramental worship. Banish the Manual Acts, the standing for the Creed and for the comfortable words, eliminate the white linen cloth, the environment of music and architecture — what does it matter, so long as we feel all right? Against such an attitude we must ever be vigilant.

Finally, we would set down very briefly a few considerations which might justify a regret that Methodism has, officially at least, banished the Manual Acts from her service of Holy Communion.

1. The Manual Acts are symbols in a service where symbolism abounds. The white linen cloth, the covered elements, the kneeling to receive communion, the delivery of the elements to the communicants 'into their hands', all play their part in the high drama. Such symbolism ought not to be belittled. Rightly understood and reverently interpreted, the Manual Acts, as all symbols, say what no words can utter. They are eloquent when words prove a clumsy medium of expression. 'The actions in the Eucharist have this dramatic and poetic value and they must not be robbed of their power' (D. H. Hislop: *Our Heritage in Public Worship*, p. 234). Dr. W. H. Frere classifies the Manual Acts under the heading of 'Interpretative Ceremonial'; that is, 'they take place while words are being said and they serve to bring out their meaning more clearly, or else to indicate some point in connexion with the words that needs to be brought out' (*Principles of Religious Ceremonial*, p. 117).

2. The Manual Acts give rightful prominence to the elements. The bread and the wine are no mere adjuncts to the service; but, at the climax to which the pre-communion and the prayer of humble access moves, they are brought to the immediate attention of the worshippers.

3. The Manual Acts are in line with the best Reformed Tradition. The work of the Reformers was to preserve the essentials of the rite after they had been sifted from the accretions of the centuries. We must beware of conceiving our Communion Service in such a way that 'those august and primitive actions which the Reformers were burnt to win for us from the confused millinery of the Mass are not now thought worth repeating'. These are the words of Bernard Lord Manning who also points out, 'The Reformation . . . on the one hand abandoned all rites that bore no direct and obvious reference to the Supper. On the other hand [and this was more important] it emphasized the few actions which make the celebration'. (See his *Essays in Orthodox Dissent*, pp. 55 and 61.) The Manual Acts are among 'the few actions which make the celebration'.

4. The Manual Acts are like a golden thread running from the Upper Room on that 'dark betrayal night' through the celebrations down the centuries under their various names — The Breaking of the Bread, The Lord's Supper, The Eucharist, The Liturgy, The Mass, The Holy Communion — bestowing some unity amid much diversity. If a first-century Christian could enter one of our

churches when a Communion service was in progress he would not understand the language (not even the Latin of the Roman Church); the hymns would sound strange to his ears and the architecture would look strange to his sight; but if he saw the minister take first the bread and then the cup in his hands, he would, we feel sure, know what was taking place in his presence. We do not, of course, suggest that such a visit is a contingency to reckon with, but we would point out that these expressive actions are not distinctly Anglican or Roman, but they have been and are an integral part of a distinctively Christian rite as it has been performed in all the sections of Christendom down the ages. Surely Methodism, which 'claims and cherishes her place in the Holy Catholic Church' (Deed of Union) ought not to discard them as lightly as she appears to have done.

Without presuming to act the part of our Lord, without pretending that there is magic in the ministerial touch, we would suggest that it would be fitting to find a place for these simple actions in our Communion Service. In the Methodist Order of Service the performance of the Manual Acts is not even optional, much less obligatory, to the minister. Much will depend upon his own sense of their usefulness and appropriateness. Maybe some of our ministers do restore these acts to a suitable place in their services; if so, we hope they will not be counted as innovators or heretics, but at least as true sons of John Wesley and maintainers of a great Protestant tradition.

JOHN C. BOWMER

TO THE MOUNT

The Background of the Transfiguration

IN my previous essay,¹ it was suggested that Jesus told the story of His temptations to His disciples (as He must have done if the narrative is genuine) in order that they might understand His method, and why He rejected methods which strongly appealed to them. An obvious test of this theory is to ask whether we can see any point in the ministry of Jesus at which the story might naturally have been told. This second article will attempt to show that there is such a point, and that if the story was told then, many other details of the ministry appear in a clearer perspective.

The temptations came to Jesus because of His consciousness that He was the Messiah for whom Israel waited. There could be no reason for Him to tell the story to His disciples until they too had come to see Him in this light. According to the Synoptic tradition, the first disciple to do so was Simon Peter, when at Caesarea Philippi he answered Jesus's question 'Who do men say that I am?' with the words 'Thou art the Christ'.² If we accept this tradition we may suppose that the story of the temptations was told after the confession at Caesarea Philippi.

In the temptations, it was argued, Jesus resisted the impulse to test His Messiahship by His power to supply material need or by God's readiness to deliver Him in extremity; and He rejected the suggestion that either the need

¹ 'In the Wilderness', *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July 1945.

² Mark viii. 29.

or the extremity of God's Chosen implied any failure of God's sovereignty or of His title to loyalty. In the temptations, that is to say, Jesus took the first decisive step along the road which led to the Cross — not merely to the acceptance of suffering and death, but to their use in the working out of God's purpose. Now it is this doctrine which Jesus begins to teach His disciples immediately after Peter's confession has been made. Their reaction to it is one of revulsion. What more natural way of helping them over the initial difficulties could Jesus take than by telling them of His own temptations and of how He overcame them?

The account in Mark of what followed Peter's confession provides a very attractive setting of the story. When Peter says 'Thou art the Christ', Jesus charges His disciples 'that they should tell no man of Him. And he began to teach them, that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.'¹ Matthew inserts after this confession Jesus's eulogy of Peter, with the famous 'Upon this rock will I build My church',² and then proceeds as Mark does, save for the one additional note that the suffering and death of Jesus are to take place in Jerusalem.³ The Lucan version agrees throughout with Mark.

After this passage Mark (followed by Matthew but not by Luke, who omits this part of the story) describes the reaction of Peter. 'And Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him. But He turning about, and seeing His disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind Me, Satan: for thou mindest not the things of God but the things of men.'⁴ Satan! It requires little imagination to see Peter's hurt and bewildered face when he heard such a name applied to him, so soon after his great declaration. What had he said to earn this stinging rebuke? Nor is it hard to see Jesus smile as He explains that Peter's attitude was in fact that which Satan had taken up in the wilderness. The account of the temptations follows very naturally.

It is difficult, indeed, to avoid the conclusion that Jesus must have given some such explanation at this point, if the sayings which follow are in their proper context. 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.'⁵ This demands some previous explanation of the suffering of the Messiah if it is not to be wholly cryptic: and it may be noted that the following words 'What doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his life' (ψυχή = 'life' or 'soul') come aptly after the story of the third temptation.

If the suggestion could find no more confirmation than this we should be left with an attractive but quite unsupported conjecture. We move from conjecture to something more substantial when we go on to consider the larger context of the scene at Caesarea Philippi. This needs some reconstruction, as we shall find: but it is possible to discern an order of events during this period which has both an introduction to this line of thought and a sequel to it. It is scarcely necessary to point out that if we can demonstrate the truth of this last statement, we shall have done more than find a natural placing of the

¹ Mark viii. 30, 31.

² Matthew xvi. 17-19

³ Matthew xvi. 21.

⁴ Mark viii. 32, 33.

⁵ Mark viii. 34, 35.

temptation-stories. We shall have made a contribution to the vexed question as to the outline of the ministry.

We may begin with another suggestion of the previous essay, that there was real significance in Jesus' submission to the baptism of the wilderness-preacher, John the Baptist. At least for a time Jesus regarded his teaching with approval. 'Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist.'¹ It may well be that for a time Jesus was actually associated with John in his work. Mark says that our Lord's ministry in Galilee did not begin until 'after that John was delivered up',² and Matthew agrees in the rather peculiar phrase 'When He heard that John was delivered up, He withdrew into Galilee,'³ as though He had been previously active somewhere else. There is no hint in the Synoptists of an earlier ministry, but the possibility is not excluded.

John's Gospel, however, tells explicitly of a ministry parallel with that of the Baptist. After the miracle at Cana, the cleansing of the Temple, and the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus (already a well-known teacher who had His own disciples) came 'into the land of Judæa; and there He tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized. For John was not yet cast into prison.'⁴ The last sentence can only have been inserted to point the contrast between this account and the familiar Marcan opening.

After a passage concerning the attitude of John and of his disciples to this activity of Jesus,⁵ the Fourth Gospel continues: 'When therefore the Lord knew how that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John (although Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples), He left Judæa and departed again into Galilee.'⁶ Bernard has pointed out that the first verse here is clumsy, and that the text may be corrupt;⁷ and it is difficult to take seriously the parenthetical denial that Jesus Himself baptized; but the general evidence as to method is clear enough. This brings us to a point at which the Marcan story of the Galilean ministry may be supposed to begin.

It seems reasonable to suppose that Jesus began His ministry, after His baptism and temptation, in much the same kind of work as John. John's message, with its overt reference to the ancient tradition of Israel, had had its effect. There were differences, no doubt. All three Synoptists tell of a question which was put to Jesus (according to Matthew, by John's disciples). 'Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?'⁸ But the fact that questions were asked about differences points to an underlying similarity. When John was delivered up and Jesus began His work in Galilee, it was a work in which the Baptist was not forgotten.

When we look for specific details in which this is to be seen, we think immediately of the choice of the disciples. 'He goeth up into the mountain and calleth unto Him whom He Himself would: and they went unto Him. And He appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils.'⁹ The correspondence of the twelve disciples with the twelve tribes of Israel has often been remarked.

¹ Matthew xi. 11.

² Mark i. 14.

³ Matthew iv. 12.

⁴ John iii. 22-24.

⁵ John iii. 25 ff.

⁶ John iv. 1-3.

⁷ I.C.C. on John, I, p. 132.

⁸ Mark ii. 18 and parallels.

⁹ Mark iii. 13-15.

May
of th
Th
the s
to se
spiri
save
with
soug
cloak
if we
the n
Egy
out,
and
even
'jewe
essay
Th
the a
mann
there
from
is Eli
Hero
There
speak
befor
mann
the p
tradit
Not
of the
is forc
Even
theory
menti
at som
necess
wheth
story.
of tim
linked

The

⁸ So M
⁹ Mark
2

May we see in this chosen company a 'Fellowship of the Mount', the nucleus of the New Israel which was to succeed where the Old Israel had failed?

This passage should be closely related with that which records in more detail the sending out of the disciples. 'And He called unto Him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and He gave them authority over the unclean spirits; and He charged them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money in their purse; but to go shod with sandals: and, said He, put not on two coats.'¹ The commentators have sought an illuminating parallel in 'heathen preachers in rough philosopher's cloak, equipped with staff and wallet',² or in the friars of the Dark Ages;³ but if we keep the rough figure of John the Baptist in mind, we shall look rather to the nomads of the desert, and in particular to the tribes whom Moses led out of Egypt. The Book of Exodus gives a vivid picture of them as they waited to go out, in the words of Jehovah: 'With your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand.'⁴ It is true that the ancient Israelites took bread, even to the kneading-troughs in which it was made, and money, and clothes — 'jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment.'⁵ As we saw in the previous essay, Jesus was improving on the Mosaic method.

That we are justified in suggesting here a link, through John the Baptist, with the ancient days in the desert, is shown by the passage which Mark, in his manner, interpolates in the story of the disciples' mission. 'King Herod heard thereof; for His name had become known: and he said, John the Baptist is risen from the dead, and therefore do these powers work in Him. But others said, It is Elijah. And others said, It is a prophet, even as one of the prophets. But Herod, when he heard thereof, said, John, whom I beheaded, he is risen.'⁶ There follows the story of the Baptist's execution. Herod can hardly have been speaking literally. Many people could assure him that Jesus had been alive before John's death. The passage shows that Jesus was recognizably in the manner of John the Baptist. It also shows how popular rumour was busy about the person of our Lord, and was finding a direct connexion with the ancient tradition of Israel. 'It is Elijah.' The suggestion recurs at Caesarea Philippi.

Now here we have one of the turning points of the ministry. The suggestion of the late Professor Burkitt is well known, that from this point onward Jesus is forced to avoid Galilee because the suspicions of Herod have been aroused.⁷ Even such a disciple of the Form-Critical school as Rawlinson, who rejects the theory that Mark gives a generally trustworthy outline of the ministry, says: 'The mention of Herod here can only be explained on the assumption that his attitude at some stage of our Lord's ministry became threatening (cf. Luke viii. 31) and necessitated the withdrawal of Jesus from his dominions.'⁸ The point at issue is whether this necessity covers a larger stretch of Mark's narrative than this one story. Is there any continuity in the thought and activity of Jesus over a period of time? We reach the object of this part of our study when we realize that it is linked throughout with the story of the temptations in the wilderness.

The previous essay suggested, as the explanation of the second temptation,

¹ Mark vi. 7-9.

² Wendland, quoted by Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, pp. 75-6.

³ So Major, *Mission and Message of Jesus*, p. 85.

⁴ Exodus xii. 11.

⁵ Exodus xii. 34-35.

⁶ Mark vi. 14-16.

⁷ *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 89-95.

⁸ *St. Mark*, p. 78.

that Jesus was visited at the outset of His ministry by a premonition of disaster, the inexplicable disaster which had befallen so often even the righteous among God's chosen people. The earliest days of His subsequent activity were, however, to all appearance successful. What was it which brought back the presage of catastrophe, and set Him to work out the unique response to the threatening danger which is full-grown in His mind at Cæsarea Philippi?

An obvious answer may be found in the violent end of John the Baptist, His forerunner and friend. It is appropriate that the first clear hint of danger which appears in Mark is given by Jesus in answer to the question about fasting which has already been mentioned, in which the disciples of John are contrasted with the disciples of Jesus. 'Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? . . . But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day.'¹ As we consider Herod's reaction to Jesus, we may well suppose that this is the reason why the death of the Baptist is recorded at such length in Mark, not merely as a matter of interest, but because it was of such importance. It is of precise significance that it is recorded at the very point where it becomes clear that Herod is regarding Jesus in the same way as he had regarded John. The calamity which Jesus had foreseen has raised its head in a definite form. The second of the temptations is recurring and must be dealt with.

If this is so, it explains also why the mission of the disciples was not continued. Why should Jesus suddenly change His method, and turn from evangelistic work on a large scale to a more private life with the disciples? It is reasonable to suggest that it was because He had realized that His premonition had been only too true. He was not to be allowed an unopposed triumph in His public ministry. If He was to continue to reject the thought of claiming Divine intervention and deliverance, He must prepare to meet and to deal with the calamity which had overwhelmed John. Upon the disciples, if He met with John's fate, everything would depend. 'And He saith unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while. For there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.'² Out of the throng and press He takes His disciples back to the wilderness. At least, He tries to: we are told that He did not immediately succeed.

'They went away in the boat to a desert place apart. And the people saw them going, and many knew them, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them. And He came forth and saw a great multitude, and He had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and He began to teach them many things. And when the day was now far spent, His disciples came unto Him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far spent: send them away, that they may go into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat.'³ The people are hanging upon His word, and they are hungry. Here is the stage set for the first temptation. The word is the primary consideration, but these are listening to it, and Jesus cannot feel that their hunger is of no importance. Perhaps as an experiment, perhaps as an object-lesson to the disciples, Jesus feeds the multitude, having nothing by Him but five loaves and two small fishes: 'and they did all eat, and were filled.'⁴

¹ Mark ii. 19-20.² Mark vi. 31.³ Mark vi. 32-36.⁴ Mark vi. 42.

The sequel is of great interest. Mark says simply: 'And straightway He constrained His disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before Him unto the other side . . . while He Himself sendeth the multitude away. And after He had taken leave of them, He departed into the mountain to pray.'¹ If the Fourth Gospel has preserved a true reminiscence, the reason is not far to seek. 'Jesus therefore perceiving that they' (the multitude) 'were about to come and take Him by force, to make Him king, withdrew again into the mountain Himself alone.'² In plain terms, a Jewish crowd had seen in the miraculous feeding its obvious significance. Here was another Moses, to lead his people out of bondage. As Jesus had feared, they hailed Him without hesitation as their expected Deliverer, and would have used force to set Him at their head.

The miracle had failed in its spiritual purpose. The Fourth Gospel goes on to say so plainly. When Jesus next met some of the people who had been present at the feeding, He said 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you.'³ In other words, 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'⁴ They ask what they are to do, and demand a sign by which they may believe. 'What workest thou? Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written, He gave them bread out of heaven to eat. Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven.'⁵ It is a strong argument for the reliability of this part of the Johannine account that it makes explicit the reference to Moses which we have found implicit in the Synoptists.

At this point we must leave the direct line of argument for a digression concerning the probable course of events as far as Cæsarea Philippi, because of the disagreement of the sources. Of these there are really only two. Since the Matthæan account clearly rests on Mark, and Luke is silent, only Mark and John remain to be discussed.

Between them there is little obvious agreement. Both, however, have been much criticized. There are grave objections, for instance, to the Marcan relation of two miracles of feeding. Moreover, the feeding is followed in each case by a crossing of the lake, and this in its turn by controversy with the Pharisees. The parallelism has been pressed farther, but not conclusively.⁶ If we suppose that Mark viii. 1-12 is a doublet of vi. 35-vii. 23 (though this, as we shall see, needs some modification) and accept the further conclusion which this necessitates, that viii. 13-21 is a homily composed after the union of the two sets of doublets, we are left with vi. 35-vii. 37 (to be compared with viii. 1-21) and with viii. 22-26 as Mark's account of the period under consideration.

Nor does the Fourth Gospel, as it stands, present a clearer picture. On one theory of dislocation, however, by which John v. 1-47, vii. 15-24 should follow John vi, a possible sequence emerges which may be set beside that of Mark. The

¹ Mark vi. 45-46.² John vi. 15.³ John vi. 26, 27.⁴ Matthew iv. 4.⁵ John vi. 30-32.⁶ cf. Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, pp. 85f., 103f.

two are not identical, but they have points of contact, and can be linked as complementary, not contradictory sources.

The miraculous feeding is recorded in Mark vi. 35-46=viii. 1-9, and with general agreement in John vi. 5-15. It is followed by a lake-crossing when Jesus walks on the water (Mark vi. 47-52 = viii. 10, John vi. 16-21). The scene on the other side of the lake is portrayed in Mark vi. 53-56, with a subsequent controversy in vii. 1-23. The same sequence is followed in Mark viii. 11-12, and in John vi. 22-65. It must be admitted, however, that the controversy in Mark vii. 1-23 is in quite different terms from that in the other passages quoted, in which Mark and John agree on the central theme. We shall find it better to reserve Mark vii. 1-23 for a later stage in the narrative. It will suffice to place together Mark vi. 53-56, viii. 11-12, and John vi. 22-65. Here perhaps we may place the period of defection recorded in John vi. 66-71, with the hasty retreat across the lake of Mark viii. 13-15 (16-21 being clearly unhistorical).

Now John, vi. 4, has remarked on the nearness of the Passover, and with this the 'green grass' of Mark vi. 39 agrees well enough. It is possible to suppose that this Passover is the feast of John v. 1, for which Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Next, therefore, we may take the events of John v. 1-47, vii. 15-24, postponing the rest of Mark's narrative until after John vii. 1, when Jesus walked again in Galilee. Here the controversy of Mark vii. 1-23 will fit very well, with the subsequent journeyings to Tyre and Sidon (vii. 24-30), to Decapolis and the eastern shores of Galilee (vii. 31-37), and on to Bethsaida (viii. 22-26) and Caesarea Philippi.

This sequence is of course purely conjectural; but let us return to the argument which was interrupted by this digression. After the feeding of the Five Thousand, according to the composite narrative which we have now outlined, Jesus goes into the mountain to pray. The disciples set out across the lake, hindered by a contrary wind, and Jesus comes to them on the water. Is the cryptic Marcan note 'and He would have passed by them'¹ a hint at the decision of Jesus to avoid spectacular miracles if possible? Mark comments on the amazement of the disciples 'For they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened.'² So in the Exodus story the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, man being perpetually unable to discern spiritual purpose in material events.

They put in at Gennesaret (Mark vi. 53)³ or at Capernaum (John vi. 17, 24), on Galilean territory in either case, and Jesus is immediately surrounded by people who want more material miracles (Mark vi. 53-56) and demand a sign (Mark viii. 11-12=John vi. 22-65). Jesus' refusal to satisfy the demand, and the ever-present threat from Herod, are quite sufficient to explain the defection of many disciples (John vi. 66-71), since even the twelve need all their sense of loyalty. The departure by boat, when the disciples forget to take bread, may well be an historical reminiscence of a time of great pressure. Both the Pharisees and Herod are explicitly connected with it (Mark viii. 13-15). The second temptation is still to be dealt with.

The account of the Passover which follows in John v. 1-47, vii. 15-24, opens with the story of the healing of the man by the pool of Bethesda. The resulting

¹ Mark vi. 48.

² Mark vi. 52.

³ The Dalmanutha of viii. 10 is still unidentified, and may be a mere transliteration of the Aramaic words 'into the parts of', which has slipped into the Greek text by error.

⁴ John

controversy is caused by the fact that this was done on the Sabbath. Jesus answers the criticism, and the controversy moves to the question of the unique authority which He claims. This is not peculiar to this chapter. We cannot lay too much stress on the fact that it is of course the root from which all the temptations spring. But the manner in which Jesus proceeds to argue His case has a clear connexion, unprepared in John, with the sequence of thought which we have been following. He argues that the works which He has done shall lead to even greater works, notably the resurrection of the dead,¹ an answer of course to the problem of the death of the righteous: and when He goes on to refer to the witness of the Baptist, so recently dead,² and to the underlying testimony of the scriptures, with special reference to the true understanding of Moses,³ it is difficult not to feel that we are permitted to watch His mind still at work upon the problem which had first confronted Him in the second temptation, and which was now so urgent.

'After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for He would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews sought to kill Him.'⁴ Galilee, as we have seen, was not a safe place either. If we are right in assuming that Mark vii. 1-23 should be read next, we may find in the mention of 'the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which had come from Jerusalem' a reference to the controversy of the preceding Passover visit. The introduction of scribes from Jerusalem is purely fortuitous in Mark as it stands, but on this theory it is very much in place. Moreover, the Marcan passage concerns the proper interpretation of the Mosaic law. Jesus says that the scribes and Pharisees 'make void the word of God' by their tradition;⁵ precisely the view which we have seen in John. It looks as though the controversy begun in Jerusalem was carried into Galilee and there continued. The threat of the Jerusalem authorities was added to the threat from Herod.

'From thence He arose,' says Mark vii. 24 'and went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon. And He entered into a house, and would have no man know it.' He has withdrawn from the threat of danger into alien territory, seeking a complete retirement. There is, however, an even greater significance in the journey. He has gone to face the third temptation.

The commentators do not seem to have noticed the parallel between Mark vii. 24-30 and I Kings xvii. 8-24. The Jewish novelist Sholem Asch does so in his illuminating book *The Nazarene*. 'Then the Rabbi called us to him and said, Come, let us be gone from this place. We will go up to Tyre and Zidon. For did not God say unto Elijah the Tishbite: Arise, and go to Zarephath in Zidon? Why should we be otherwise than Elijah?'⁶ The parallel was an apt one, for Elijah was in exile from the temporal power of Ahab and Jezebel as Jesus was seeking at least a temporary refuge from Herod. Moreover, the restoration of the widow's son corresponds with the healing of the Syro-Phoenician woman's daughter.

The meaning of the story, illuminated by the Old Testament parallel, is surely that Jesus is facing the radical problem of the third temptation. Whether or not the wealth and corruption of the merchant cities of Tyre and Sidon brought again to His mind 'the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them' — they may well have seemed to a devout Jew to belong to the Devil' — the Devil's query is implicit in the Elijah story. It was from Zarephath that Elijah

¹ John v. 20-29.

² John v. 30-38.

³ John v. 39-47, vii. 15-24.

⁴ John vii. 1.

⁵ Mark vii. 13.

⁶ op. cit., p. 331.

⁷ cf. Asch, op. cit., pp. 331-51.

went to challenge the priests of Baal to the trial on Carmel: 'How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow Him: but if Baal, then follow him.'¹ Elijah's prayer is very applicable to Jesus' situation: 'O Lord, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou, Lord, art God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again.'²

With the failure of the miraculous feeding, so long as the threat of danger remained unaltered, Jesus was bound to face the problem of how God's sovereignty was to be made plain even in suffering and death. A merely negative answer, such as He had given in the desert, would no longer suffice. The rest of His ministry must provide a positive answer. We may well believe that this retirement near Tyre and Sidon, and the subsequent journey to Decapolis and the eastern shore of Galilee (Mark vii. 31-37), and then north to Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22-26) and Cæsarea Philippi (Mark viii. 27), a period for the whole of which Jesus was out of the spheres of Herod and of the Jerusalem authorities, was used to prepare the answer which He afterwards gave. There may even be a hint about His thinking in the events of the time. The two stories of healing in Mark vii. 31-37 and viii. 22-26 can be appropriately headed 'The Ears of the Deaf Unstopped' and 'The Eyes of the Blind Opened'. These are words which direct us to Deutero-Isaiah and to other and deeper thoughts soon to be expounded in the actions of our Lord.

So we come at last to Cæsarea Philippi, the *terminus ad quem* of this part of our study. If the train of thought suggested is true to the mind of Jesus, and the themes of the temptation in the wilderness did recur in this way, it would be the most natural thing in the world for Jesus to instruct His disciples in His conception of true Messiahship by telling the story to explain His rebuke to Peter. A further test of the hypothesis can now be applied. If He did so, surely some trace of the lesson will appear in the subsequent course of the ministry, especially in the puzzled thinking of the disciples as they strove to assimilate His revolutionary notions. This is precisely what does happen.

Mark's narrative proceeds from the events at Cæsarea Philippi to the story of the Transfiguration. 'After six days Jesus taketh with Him Peter, and James, and John, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves: and He was transfigured before them.'³ It is not however clear that we can move immediately to this story.

The words 'after six days' are generally taken as precise evidence for the close connexion of the Transfiguration with the Confession. They are unique in Mark, however, as a chronological reference for such a period. H. G. Wood says that the interval 'defined with curious exactness as six days . . . may reflect the influence of Exodus xxiv. 16'.⁴ Moreover, when this reference is discounted, we are free to notice that the detail of the Transfiguration story suggests an immediately preceding observance of the Feast of Tabernacles.

Now Tabernacles is the feast mentioned in John vii. 2. We have already drawn extensively upon the Johannine narrative in reconstructing the order of foregoing events. Can we do so again here? The chapter begins with Jesus in

¹ 1 Kings xviii. 21.

² 1 Kings xviii. 36-37.

³ Mark ix. 2.

⁴ Peake's Commentary, p. 691.

Galilee, apparently still in retirement.¹ He may have returned there from Caesarea Philippi to wait His time, unmoved by the mockery of His brethren, as the Feast of Tabernacles drew near.² When He goes up to the feast, He does so in secret, so that the Jews wonder where He is:³ and when He begins to teach, the Jerusalemites say: 'Is not this he whom they seek to kill?'⁴ The controversy which follows centres in His claim to Messiahship, and it is noteworthy that Jesus again speaks of His death.⁵ The comment of the Jews is interesting: 'Whither will this man go that we shall not find Him? will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?'⁶ sounds like a comment on His recent absence from Jewish territory. Moreover, the opinions of the multitude about the person of Jesus reflect exactly what the disciples at Caesarea had reported to their Master.⁷

Immediately after the feast, we may suppose, Jesus took His disciples out of Jerusalem to the Mount of Transfiguration. The account of what happened there, given without a great deal of variation by all three Synoptic Gospels, has perplexed the commentators vastly, and all manner of explanations of it have been suggested.

One fact is primary. The story has not come to us from Jesus Himself, as that of the temptations must have done, but from the disciples who were present. It stands as an experience of theirs, which may or may not have been of importance for Jesus also. Of His experience, as of the objective reality of the events recorded, we are hardly competent to make any judgement. Of the subjective validity of the experience for them — perhaps we should do better to say for one of them, since only Peter stands out clearly, and he is the traditional authority for the basic Marcan narrative — there can be little doubt, if we have been right in our account of the preparation they had undergone.

If after the experiences which had been theirs throughout His ministry, and particularly since the death of John the Baptist, Jesus told His disciples of His baptism and temptation, with the background of Old Testament reference made clear by the events through which they had just passed, men whose minds were already wrought up to a high pitch of excitement at their identification of the Deliverer of Israel might well go through a period of intense mental conflict, culminating in the seeing of visions. More, if the Old Testament background was quite clear to them, the contents of the vision which is recorded are precisely what we should expect. The ancient figures whom we have evoked to explain the symbolism of the temptation stories and the meaning of parts of the ministry reappear unchanged in the Transfiguration.

The reference to a high mountain strikes the keynote at the very beginning of the story. As has been suggested, the 'six days' may be an echo of Exodus xxiv. 16, the chapter in which Moses takes Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, with seventy of the elders of Israel, into the mountain as Jesus here takes Peter, James, and John. Jesus is 'transfigured before them: and His garments became glistering, exceeding white; so as no fuller on earth can whiten them'.⁸ So in the story of old, 'It came to pass, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai . . . that Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone by reason of His speaking with him.

¹ John vii. 1-4.

² John vii. 3-9.

³ John vii. 35.

⁴ John vii. 10-11.

⁵ John vii. 40-41.

⁶ John vii. 25.

⁷ Mark ix. 3.

⁸ John vii. 25-34.

And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, behold, the skin of his face shone; and they were afraid to come nigh him.¹

'And there appeared unto them Elijah with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus.'² Here are Prophecy and Law; more important, here are the two men whom we have seen to be prominent in the thought of Jesus. Not only Moses, who first delivered Israel and established her faith, but also Elijah, who strove and suffered to preserve her inheritance, come to talk with Jesus. The current belief that these two had escaped Hades and ascended to heaven gives added importance to Luke's addition, that they 'spake of His decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem'.³ This is the new and unwelcome element in the thought of Jesus which the disciples must learn to accept as a true interpretation of Moses and Elijah.

'Jesus, Rabbi,' says Peter, 'It is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah. For he wist not what to answer; for they became sore afraid.'⁴ The connexion with a recent celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles is clear enough, but again there is the deeper reference to the wilderness story. 'It came to pass, when Moses entered into the tent, the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the tent: and the Lord spake with Moses.'⁵ So here: 'And there came a cloud overshadowing them, and there came a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him.'⁶

The parallel with the voice which spoke at the Baptism is unmistakable. Matthew indeed repeats the actual words which he reports on that occasion, but this is no doubt a case of assimilation. Luke's 'This is my Son, my chosen'⁷ may be more original than Mark's version, for this reason. But so long as we are thinking, not of the experience of Jesus but of that of the disciples, the significance of the story is plain. Their faith in His Messiahship has received the confirmation which had been vouchsafed to Jesus Himself, and Moses and Elijah stand by His side to assure them that His novel and unwelcome expectation of suffering and death is not out of harmony with God's ancient revelation. From this point onward the disciples may fail to understand their Master, may even forsake Him in crisis, for the flesh is weak: but in the darkest moments they will keep their faith in Him, for they have heard God's voice say 'This is my beloved Son'. 'And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus only with themselves.'⁸

One last word. As they come down from the mount their minds are still at work on what they have learned. They ask Jesus, saying: 'The scribes say that Elijah must first come. And He said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: . . . But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed.'⁹ It is His epitaph on John the Baptist.

CHARLES F. DAVEY

¹ Exodus xxxiv. 29-30.

² Mark ix. 4.

³ Luke ix. 31.

⁴ Mark ix. 5-6.

⁵ Exodus xxxiii. 9.

⁶ Mark ix. 7.

⁷ Matthew xvii. 5.

⁸ Luke ix. 35.

⁹ Mark ix. 8.

¹⁰ Mark ix. 11-13.

LUCRETIUS¹

A Tribute After Two Thousand Years

SOME of us are so fashioned that when we learn that a man has been bitterly and persistently condemned and his writings banned by generation after generation of the hierarchy of some religious cultus we are immediately predisposed in his favour. Fools do not figure in an *Index Expurgatorius*; that distinction is reserved for those of whose ability the compilers of the *Index* are afraid.

Such an individual is Lucretius, or, to give him his full name, Titus Lucretius Carus. According to reliable tradition he died on 15th October 55 B.C.; that is, 2,000 years ago, at the age of 44. He was born in Rome, but of the main facts of his life we know nothing, and it is futile to discuss legends, surmises, and dubious references.

Until recent times an appreciative allusion to Lucretius in the pages of a reputable religious journal would have constituted an offence and a stumbling-block to many of its readers and would have created a minor scandal in certain exotic coteries of the ecclesiastical world, for was not this man one of the arch-enemies of Religion, denying alike the existence of God and the immortality of the soul? He has been widely condemned, solely on the enormity of this charge, by many who have never brought him before the judgement-seat of their reason nor put him in the witness-box of such intelligence as they possessed; who have never asked who this 'God' is, whose existence he is supposed to have denied, or in what doctrine of immortality he has expressed disbelief. Among the more enlightened of his critics was Lactantius, the early Christian apologist and learned author of the fascinating *Divine Institutions*. With certain slight exceptions he was stern in his condemnation, but directed most of his indictment, nominally, against Epicurus, whose teaching Lucretius sponsored and expounded. Dante put Epicurus and all his tribe in hell, battened down in flaming sepulchres designed for heretics, and doubtless he had a specially heated and uncomfortable one reserved for Lucretius.

During the Middle Ages he was known only to a select few, but as men came to understand him better his admirers inevitably increased and it was allowed that men could entertain regard for him without being committed to all his opinions. Not many ecclesiastics were happy in his company, and those who were became suspected by their brethren of rather dreadful tendencies. The Reformers, Calvin, Luther, and Knox, whose direct knowledge of him was probably meagre, were hostile. The Papacy of the Middle Ages was, of course, committed to the technique of Aristotle, and presently, when Jordano Bruno (1548-1600) proclaimed ideas in part coincident with those of Lucretius and dared even to quote from his writings in support of his own belief in an infinitely extended universe, the Papacy sent him to the stake. In the seventeenth century a Christian as liberally minded as Ralph Cudworth, the Cambridge Platonist, could describe him as 'the atheistick poet'; and about the same time Lucy Hutchinson, better known for her *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, her husband, issued a translation of the work of Lucretius in English verse, in

¹Most of the translations are by W. H. D. Rouse in the *Loeb Classical Library*, by kind permission of the publishers, Messrs. Heinemann.

order to warn her readers against this advocate of a 'pernicious', 'execrable doctrine'; 'this dog', 'this lunatic'. Passing references by unauthoritative persons are often indicative of bodies of popular opinion. There is Lord Byron's allusion in *Don Juan* (Canto I, 43):

Lucretius' irreligion is too strong
For early stomachs to prove wholesome food;

also Mrs. Browning's not wholly unsympathetic judgement in *A Vision of Poets*:

Lucretius — nobler than his mood:
Who dropped his plummet down the broad
Deep universe, and said 'No God',

Finding no bottom: he denied
Divinely the divine, and died
Chief poet on the Tiber-side,

By grace of God! his face is stern,
As one compelled, in spite of scorn,
To teach a truth he could not learn.

Lovers of Sir Walter Scott will recall the cynical, chickenhearted, free-thinking Parliamentary officer, Bletson, in *Woodstock*, who, after a night of what appeared to be supernatural horrors, was found by Colonel Markham Everard with a book under his pillow, evidently to act as a charm. He tried to pass it off as 'Lucretius, my darling Lucretius', desiring both to sustain his own reputation for bold infidelity and to shock the religious susceptibilities of Everard. The latter, however, discovered the deceit; it was a Bible: the Bible that Bletson, on ordinary occasions, delighted to ridicule. 'No, Master Bletson — this is not Lucretius, but a fitter comforter in dread or in danger. Why should you be ashamed of it? . . . If you can but anchor your heart upon this volume, it may serve you in better stead than Lucretius.'

Here also is Edward Fitzgerald, in one of his letters:

I have been regaling myself, in my unscholarly way, with . . . Lucretius. . . I venerate the earnestness of the man, and the power with which he makes some music even from his hardest Atoms. . . I forget if Lucretius is in Dante; he should have been the Guide through Hell; but perhaps he was too deep in it to get out for a holiday.

What, as a matter of interest, was John Wesley's opinion of Lucretius? Actually, we do not know, but he must have had one. In that incisive pamphlet, *An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, (65), occurs his solitary quotation. He is asking his readers how Religion appears to them. 'Righteousness looking down from Heaven is indeed to us no displeasing sight. But how does it appeal to you?'

Horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans? (Bk. I. 65)

viz., Do you see Religion as Lucretius saw *Religio*? Threatening mortals from on high with hideous aspect?

It was an apt quotation, but nothing more. Its use by no means implies that what John Wesley meant by *Religion* and what Lucretius meant by *Religio* were held by Wesley to be one and the same; he was far too acutely minded for that. Clearly he knew his Lucretius, but *nowhere does he condemn his teaching*. This is interesting, for where Wesley disapproved he did not hesitate to condemn. At his second Conference, in 1745, he drew up a remarkable booklist for his own and, apparently, his preachers' reading, in which the longest sections are those of the Greek and Latin Classics. Cæsar, Cicero, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Juvenal, and others appear, but not Lucretius. This is significant when we recollect that Wesley had a warm admiration for a fine Latin style, and that of Lucretius is particularly brilliant. Arguments from silence are notoriously unsafe, but it seems fair to conclude that, whilst Wesley was not prepared to introduce Lucretius to his preachers, he himself had an unbiased mind toward him. His interest in scientific matters is well known, and it is not unlikely that the theories of Lucretius attracted and interested him, whilst at the same time he was sensitive to the dangerous allurements of a materialistic philosophy, and against these he thought it best to guard his preachers by excluding Lucretius from their notice.

He is known to us through his sole work, *De Rerum Natura* — 'Concerning the Nature of Things' — which is one of our outstanding legacies from the ancient world. It is an unfinished, didactic poem, written in hexameters, running to over 7,400 lines and dispersed through six books. His work reveals him in three aspects, in each of which he is an imposing figure: poet, philosopher, and scientist: this last ascription requiring certain qualifications which modern usage makes necessary.

Lucretius holds a distinguished place in a great philosophical succession; he is even regarded by some as the supreme and most authoritative exponent of the school, and with good reason. His spiritual lineage reaches back to Epicurus, the Greek philosopher of the third century B.C., and through him, in certain respects, to Democritus, behind whom looms the shadowy Leucippus. Scholarship is still confronted with the task of rescuing Epicurus and his philosophy from the ignominy which has befallen them, in that the words *Epicure* and *Epicurean* have become synonyms for a voluptuary who makes sensual pleasure, particularly eating and drinking, the *summum bonum* of his existence. 'Hedonist!' men contemptuously exclaim, and proceed to fling the stones of their moral indignation at a puppet labelled 'Epicurus'. How unjust this is the reader of the few remains of his writings knows well. Listen to his own words, taken from one of his letters:

When we call pleasure the end of life we do not mean the pleasure of the profligate or the voluptuary, as some declare. . . . We mean freedom from pain of body or disturbance of mind. The life of pleasure does not come from drinking or from revel on revel, or from sensual pleasures. . . . It comes from sober thoughts, exploring the grounds of all our choices and avoidances, and expelling the notions which expose the soul to most disturbance. Practical good sense is the origin of all this and the greatest of goods. . . . It teaches us that we cannot live pleasurably unless we live wisely and nobly and justly, nor wisely and nobly and justly unless we live pleasurably.

This is sufficiently explicit to exonerate Epicurus and his disciples, Lucretius among them, from the sinister implications of the word *Epicurean* as it is currently used. Lucretius abundantly confirms this in the *De Rerum Natura* itself. This is no work of a man of loose morals or sense-bound vision; or of a glutton and a wine-bibber, to whom the gratification of the body's appetites means the contentment of whatever kind of a soul is left to him. Read, for example, the opening of Book II, in which he deplores the struggles for wealth and power and holds that

all that *nature* demands is a body free from pain and a mind which, kept free from care and fear, enjoys a feeling of delight. Therefore few things are necessary for the bodily nature (*corpoream ad naturam*). What the bulk of mankind regards as treasures (*gazae*) are unprofitable for body and mind alike.

O miseras hominum mentes, O pectora caeca! he wails: O pitiable minds of men, O blind intelligences!

In describing Lucretius as a *scientist* we need to be clear about our meaning. According to the restricted modern use of the word a scientist is one who seeks knowledge of the physical universe in its organic and inorganic aspects by way of observation, experiment, and hypothesis, leading, sometimes, to verification. In this process imagination plays an important part, and the 'brilliant' scientist is he who makes 'brilliant' guesses, which are found to be correct *within the framework of our present system of knowledge*. Imagination is never far away from observed fact, and after its most extended flight it returns to fact again. Further, the modern scientist largely selects his conditions. As far as possible he isolates the phenomena he is investigating from all outside influences, in order to ascertain what they are like in themselves; or he introduces outside influences, selectively, in order to observe the reactions of the phenomena to the new conditions.

Lucretius was no *scientist* in this sense. To what extent experiment was practised in the ancient world is an interesting question; certainly it was on no scale and in no manner comparable with those of modern times;¹ for one thing, the delicate measuring and observing instruments of the modern laboratory were centuries away. Only two elements of our technique were employed by a scientist like Lucretius: observation and hypothesis. Verification was, for the most part, left 'in the air', as is obvious when we consider such complex and finely-spun theories as are advanced by Plato in the *Timaeus*. This, from our standpoint, is a severe limitation, but it enhances our admiration for the brilliant 'guesses' which our author put forward. His poem is more than an exposition of the philosophy of Epicurus. Very happily Sir R. W. Livingstone states that 'the Epicurean temper is troubled and refracted in passing through the medium of the passionate personality of the Roman'.² It is with a 'Lucretianized' Epicurus that we are dealing and it will be convenient to refer to Lucretius himself the ideas, whatever their original source, which are advanced in his poem and are so strenuously maintained by him.

Observation and hypothesis! Twin guides, that bring men perilously near to *a priori* dogmatism! The hypotheses, as we meet them in classical and later

¹ On this point the reader who is interested should consult the admirable little 'Pelican' book, *Greek Science: Its Meaning for Us*, by Benjamin Farrington.

² *The Mission of Greece*, p. 14.

writers, vary between the brilliant and the absurd, as viewed from a modern standpoint. The hypotheses of Lucretius are always of the brilliant, never of the absurd order. In thought forms of necessity different from those we employ today, he advances theories of the nature of the physical universe and associated phenomena which approximate in striking fashion to scientific concepts of today, and are never out of harmony with his cosmology taken as a whole. The universe as he sees it consists of matter (*materia*: the mother stuff) and void (vacuum: but he uses another word, *inane*): our matter and space. This void is necessary for motion and is infinitely extended. It is not *real* in the sense that matter is real, for it is merely absence of matter. The *materia* is composed of *atoms* of different shapes and sizes. These are matter in its final analysis, being invisible, indivisible, impenetrable, indestructible, and infinite in number. Lucretius has no one name for them, but refers to them variously as *corpuscula*, *corpora prima*, *primordia rerum*, *principia*, *genitalia materiai corpora*, etc. They move 'downward' (*deorsum*: whatever that may mean!) at a uniform speed, and so long as this movement is maintained they can never coalesce to produce matter in its various forms. Therefore Lucretius puts forward his famous theory of the 'swerve' (*clinamen* — a word occurring but this once in Latin literature. Bk II, 292). 'At times quite uncertain and at uncertain places, they swerve a little from their course.' Thus they collide and bring about, through their various configurations, the forms of matter that exist around us, whose qualities are determined by the size, shape, number, and arrangement of the minute components themselves.

Crude as this Atomic Theory is, it is yet the forerunner of John Dalton's (1766-1844) and it gains prestige when we remember that the mere suggestion of such a theory was ridiculed by philosophers almost to the time of Leibnitz (1646-1716), whose *Monadology* was a highly spiritualized and individualized form of Atomism. For long the 'swerve' element was regarded with some amusement by idealist philosophers, as being the Achilles' heel of the whole materialistic theory, as, indeed, it is. As Lucretius was unable to advance any reason for the 'swerve' of his atoms, occurring 'at times quite uncertain and at uncertain places,' (*incerto tempore ferme incertisque locis*), he had reluctantly to allow the supra-natural to break illicitly into his sequence of cause and effect and disturb its rigidity. He used its presence, however, by making this indeterminacy in the atoms the cause of man's freedom of will. Here are his words:

If all motion is always one long chain, and new motion always arises out of the old in order invariable, and if the first beginnings (*primordia*, viz. atoms) do not make by swerving (*declinando*) a beginning of motion such as to break the decrees of fate, that cause may not follow cause to infinity, whence comes this free will (*libera*) in living creatures all over the earth? (Bk. II, 251).

Lucretius appears to have believed that there is a spontaneity in the atom, a power of self-determination, which persists in the peculiar conglomeration of the atoms constituting a living body and manifesting itself in the free will of the individual. The idea is ingenious, but the maggot of indeterminacy is there at the core of his materialistic apple to prove its ultimate ruin. The marvels of

the internal structure of the atom as revealed by modern physics were unimagined and unimaginable by Lucretius, but the physicist today is confronted by the same inexplicable 'freedom' in its internal economy, and has tracked it to a centre remotely withdrawn within the heart of the Atom itself.

Hence our wonder at the imaginative power of Lucretius increases. He further enunciated a theory of the Conservation of Energy and the Indestructibility of Matter. It is not quantities but qualities that change and pass. Listen to him.

In whatsoever motion the bodies of first beginnings (*principiorum corpora*, viz., atoms) are now, in that same motion they were in ages gone by, and hereafter they will always be carried along in the same way.

Nor can any power change the sum total of things, for there is no place without (*extra*) into which any kind of matter could flee away from the all (*ex omni*); and there is no place whence a new power (*vis*) could arise to burst into the all, and to change the nature of things and turn their motions (*motus*). (Bk. II, 297).

In a passage of great beauty he applies this principle to the human body:

We are all sprung from celestial seed (*caelesti semine*); all have that same father, from whom our fostering mother earth receives liquid drops of water, and then, teeming, brings forth bright corn and luxuriant trees, and the race of mankind; brings forth all the generations of wild beasts, providing food with which all nourish their bodies and lead a sweet life and beget their offspring; for that which once came from earth (*terra*) to earth returns back again, and what fell from the borders of ether, that is again brought back and the regions of heaven (*caeli . . . templa*) again receive it (Bk. II, 991).

Lucretius also insists that nothing can arise from nothing (*nil posse creari de nilo*). He sees the universe as a closed system of inter-dependent parts, infinitely extended and under the rigid rule of Law, except for that disconcerting 'swerve'. One is not surprised when, toward the end of the Second Book, he postulates other worlds than ours. Above, beneath, around us, illimitable space runs out in every direction, and, since the atoms are infinite in number,

it cannot by any means be thought likely that this is the only round earth and sky that has been made; that all those bodies of matter without have nothing to do. . . . You must confess that there are other assemblages of matter in other places, such as this is, which the air holds in greedy embrace (Bk. II, 1056).

Such, in bold outline, is the universe as seen by the analytical and probing mind of Lucretius. In due course he examines it in detail and advances explanations of many kinds of phenomena: light, eclipses, volcanic disturbances, the phases of the moon, dreams, etc. These, however far from being correct, are never foolish in relation to his general conception of the objective world, and are occasionally remarkable fore-shadowings of modern theories. He is never unduly dogmatic and frequently offers alternative explanations for the same phenomenon. He even assumes the role of anthropologist and gives a surprisingly accurate account of human and social development from primitive times.

Most people will find the main interest of his book in his yearning regard for the happiness of his fellow men, to which he is convinced that his philosophy would make a tremendous contribution would they but receive it. In regard to Roman society of his own day he was certainly right; it would have done. He saw 'man's life lying foully grovelling on the ground, crushed beneath the weight of *Religio*'; mankind was 'bitted and bridled by *Religio* (*religione refrenatus*)'. It is the equating of *Religio* with Religion in the enlightened modern sense of that word, and even with the Christian Religion, that has mainly led to the harsh judgements which from time to time have been passed upon him. If we insist upon translating his word *Religio* we can hardly improve upon our word 'superstition', though this is rather to express a personal opinion about *Religio* than accurately to render the meaning of the word itself. Lucretius did not hesitate to express his opinion about it in its every aspect. These 'deities' feared of men do not exist, and he exhibited in proof thereof a Universe in which there is no place for the soles of their feet, and which functions through its own internal resources. These beings were not even responsible for the creation of the world or they, assuming their existence for a moment, would have made a better job of it. It has its origin in the movements of the atoms. So Lucretius dismisses the absurd stories of a world which, in whole or in part, is brought about by the sexual union of male and female deities. He indicts *Religio* as being responsible for criminal, impious deeds, and instances the sacrifice of Iphigenia, slain by Agamemnon, her father, at the instigation of the chief priest, in order to induce the Deity to regard his fleet with favour. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum*, he concludes, in words which men have been quoting for 2,000 years: So powerful was *Religio* in persuading to evil deeds.

The 'gods' denied by Lucretius are denied by Christianity and by every rational person. They were jealous and cantankerous; unreliable and irrational. They flew into violent rages and flung thunderbolts and other unpleasant things about. They had their favourites and took sides in human disputes. They quarrelled among themselves and had illicit sexual relations both within and without the circles of Divinity. Popular *Religio* ascribed all natural phenomena inimical to human life and happiness to malevolent designs on their part. Men were never safe and either sought the protection of one deity against the evils that threatened from another, or attempted, by sacrifice and other means, to placate those whose wrath either already was, or might be, stirred against them.

In the shadowy realm beyond death men became still more defenceless against the gods. Lucretius instances *Tantalus*, beneath the rock never falling but ever threatening to fall and crush him; *Tityos*, with two vultures ceaselessly tearing at his liver; *Sisyphus*, endlessly pushing uphill the boulder that endlessly rolled back as it neared the summit; *Cerberus*, the *Furies*, and other horrors. It was not only Matthew Arnold's 'deep weariness and sated lust', but fear of the gods and the hereafter, that 'made human life a hell'.

All phenomena, Lucretius urges, are capable of a rational explanation, and he exhorts those who are 'sick and capable of fears' to look steadily at the world about them and observe the reign of Law, where the ignorant see only the reign of evil minded and capricious 'gods'.

For even as children tremble and fear all things in blind darkness, so we, in the light, fear, at times, things that are no whit more to be feared than what children shiver at in the dark, and imagine to be at hand. This terror of the mind, therefore, and this gloom must be dispelled, not by the sun's rays nor the bright shafts of day, but by the aspect and law of nature (*sed naturae species ratioque*) (Bk. II, 55).

The current fables about the hereafter and its horrors are equally foolish and pitiable. In simple fact, there is no future life such as men imagine and *Religio* teaches. Lucretius urges this at considerable length, insisting that mind (*animus*) and spirit (*anima*) are mortal like the body and are composed of the finest types of atoms. It is only in the union of body, mind, and spirit that a human being either exists or can exist. The argument is too long for a summary, but it leads up to this, that Death is not to be feared, nor does it really matter. As men were without sensation or consciousness before birth, so will it be after death; they merely cease to be, in any sense whatever. If a man has been happy in this life he should depart contented and grateful, in the spirit of W. S. Landor:

I warmed both hands before the fire of life;
It sinks, and I am ready to depart.

If he has been unhappy he should be glad to end both existence and its troubles. Birth and death mark the rhythms of life and the wise man is ready when the rhythms cease. So,

Depart with dignity . . . for the old order always passes, thrust out by the new, and one thing has to be made afresh from others; but no one is delivered into the pit (*barathrum*) or black Tartarus; matter is wanted that coming generations may grow; and yet they all, when their life is done, will follow you. . . . So one thing will never cease to arise from another, and no man possesses life in freehold — all as tenants (*vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu*). . . . Is there anything horrible in that? Is there anything gloomy? Is it not more peaceful than any sleep? (Bk. III, 962).

These are noble words, whatever we may think of their teaching, coming from one branded as an atheist and an enemy of religion. *Atheist* is a word of relative meaning, determined by social context and topographical and temporal environment. An 'atheist' in Rome in 55 B.C. was a very different person from an 'atheist' in Jerusalem at that or any other date, as were they both from an 'atheist' in medieval Christendom or modern Cairo. Before we pass judgement we need to know against what it is that a man directs his atheism. It may be, and often is, something in which intelligent people have long ceased to believe without ever calling themselves 'Atheists', and who would resent being so designated. The *atheism* of Lucretius is shared by all except the most primitive peoples of the world today and the 'gods' he denied are scouted with derision by men of almost every degree of intelligence.

But he was not an atheist *in toto*. He did not deny the existence of 'gods'; indeed, he affirmed it; he only denied the existence of the 'gods' of the popular imagination. He begins his *De Rerum Natura* by making a courteous and charming bow to two of them, *Venus* and *Mars*. In an eloquent passage he implores

the aid of the former in his composition, praying also that she will intercede with *Mars* to grant peace to a war-stricken world, for, in an age of civil strife, he finds it impossible to address himself to his work with untroubled mind. As it is *Venus* who governs the *Nature of Things*,

Te sociam studeo scribendis versibus esse:

— 'Thee I desire as my associate in writing the verses.'

A strange opening, it has been observed, for an Atheist! The suggestion that his address to the Goddess was a concession to popular religious ideas is unconvincing, for it was these he was out to destroy; nor do men of his type make such concessions. Again, they do not act in the way that Robert Bridges maintains in his *Testament of Beauty* (III, 246); that, touched by 'frenzy of Beauty',

he left

his atoms in the lurch and fell to worshipping

Aphrodite,

as the creatress and embodiment of all Beauty. Note Lucretius' own significant words:

per te (Venus) quoniam genus omne animantium concipitur

— for *through thee* is conceived every kind of living things. It is reasonable to assume that he was using the licence permitted to a poet and was personalizing the generative principle in Nature — *Venus genetrix*.

He insists that 'gods' exist, but little more can be said of them. His 'theism', such as it is, occasions some of his loveliest passages. If men care to call the Sea, *Neptune*, and corn, *Ceres*, so be it; no harm is done by such a misapplication of names for

the very nature of divinity must necessarily enjoy immortal life in the deepest peace, far removed and separated from our troubles; for without any pain, without danger, itself mighty by its own resources, needing us not at all, it is neither propitiated with services nor touched by wrath (Bk. II, 646).

Is this more than the light fancy of a poet? Some hold that it is. Others believe that under the guise of 'divinity' he is describing the ideal existence of the Epicurean, immune from all the cares, trials, toils, and vicissitudes of earthly life. In evidence they cite the famous lines that inspired the 'island valley of Avilion' passage in Tennyson's *Passing of Arthur*:

As soon as thy reasoning born of a divine intelligence begins to proclaim the nature of things, away flee the mind's terrors, the walls of the heavens (*mundi*) open out, I see action going on throughout the whole void: before me appear the gods in their majesty (*divum numen*), and their peaceful abodes, which no winds ever shake nor clouds besprinkle with rain; which no snow congealed by the bitter frost mars with its white fall, but the air ever cloudless encompasses them and laughs with its light spread wide abroad. There moreover nature supplies everything, and nothing at any time impairs their peace of mind. But contrariwise nowhere appear the regions of Acheron (Bk. III, 14).

Is this spiritual faith or wistful imagination? Did Lucretius the poet salute something from which Lucretius the philosopher averted his gaze? We do not

know. Certainly he could toss a laughing denial to a general charge of atheism, and we must confess that these creatures of his poetic fancy, ethereal and futile though they be, are free from the distasteful proclivities of the 'deities' domiciled upon Olympus.

The 'Atheism' that appears in this poem is not such as arises in a Christian context; neither is its 'Theism'. Lucretius neither affirmed nor denied the God of Christianity; as reasonable people we do not expect either the one or the other of a Roman who died in 55 B.C. Nor, for the same reason, do we chide him for not proclaiming the Christian doctrine of a Future Life. In a world with little spiritual vision he saw men burdened with fear of a hereafter of pain and suffering and he said: 'There is no such hereafter. As I see things there is no hereafter at all. Death ends everything. Life is a dance of atoms and when the dance ends you and I end too.' That was the best that he could do for his fellows in a pre-Christian, Roman society, and a courageous best it was. He was too honest to proclaim a hereafter of which there was no evidence in the nature of things as he saw them. It seemed to him that extinction was preferable to the hereafter of popular belief and most people would hold him to be right.

There is every reason to believe that his teaching was in the main unheeded. One would expect that. It was no facile, ear-catching doctrine of 'eat and drink, for tomorrow we die,' that he propounded. He demanded a fearless facing of facts; a resolute overcoming of mental lethargy and a bold advance by the human mind into the inner fastnesses of Nature. In this crusade against superstition and fear he was prepared to lead the way. 'This do', was his challenge, 'and thou shalt live.' But it was not what men wanted to do. To the majority he must have seemed but a voice crying in the wilderness of utter incomprehensibility; to the 'pious', a dangerous blasphemer against their ancient and national gods; whilst a few would feel that, however false and absurd the popular religious ideas might be, there yet lingered around some of those old stories a suggestion of a spiritual side to the universe that it was unwise to ignore. Surely it was something more and deeper than atoms falling through Void in obedience to irrefragable laws! We believe they were right, and it was these people and their like who were to provide the good soil into which the seed of the Christian Gospel was so soon to fall. For one reason and another his age received him not. Was John Buchan thinking of the closing years of the life of a disappointed man when he wrote: 'Lucretius had drawn his singing robes about him and kept himself haughtily aloof from the troubled lives of men.'¹

What, briefly, of Lucretius the *poet*? There his most vehement opponents have been constrained to admit his greatness. He was a master of the 'rise and long roll of the hexameter'.² Again and again he breaks up the concentrated hardness of his philosophical way by a passage of exquisite beauty, rich in the pagantry of Nature. Take one of many possible examples. He is about to show that atoms move at a speed greater than light and introduces his subject thus:

When the dawn diffuses new light over the earth, and the many-coloured birds, flitting about through pathless woods, fill the spaces of soft air with their liquid notes, how suddenly at such time the sun arising is wont to

¹ *Augustus*, iv. iii. 3.

² Tennyson, *Lucretius*.

envelop and flood the whole world with his light, we see to be plain and manifest to all (Bk. II, 144).

Parts of Tennyson's lovely pæan to Virgil are not inapplicable to Lucretius:

Landscape-lover, lord of language
more than he that sang the Works and Days, (Hesiod)
All the chosen coin of fancy
flashing out from many a golden phrase. . . .

All the charm of all the Muses
often flowering in a lonely word. . . .

How unforgettable, for example, is his '*flammantia moenia mundi*' (Bk. I, 73), which someone with a flair for a beautiful phrase has translated 'the flaming ramparts of the world'; and also

quasi cursores vitai lampada tradunt —

— as runners pass on the torch of life; *VITAI LAMPADA!* words which Henry Newbolt made the title of his moving and very 'English' little poem,

There's a breathless hush in the close tonight —
Ten to make and the match to win. . . .

verses that for many a reader open 'magic casements' of memory upon scenes known and loved when all the world was young. There is a stirring in the heart, too, at the possibilities that may unfold from such a thought as this:

Denique caelesti sumus omnes semine oriundi

—lastly, we are all sprung from heavenly seed.

Light and shadow; shape and colour; sky and stars and earth and sea; all lovely and growing things! — these are an unfailing delight to him. Yet he is scarcely a happy man, in spite of his philosophy, for he is haunted by that sense of the impermanent which has troubled so many fine souls. Tennyson makes him say:

Poor little life that toddles half-an-hour
Crown'd with a flower or two, and there an end. . . .

but Lucretius did not write like that, however he may have talked. To him death was the end, but he exhorted men to face it valiantly, as being nothing and mattering not a jot:

Nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinent hilum (Bk. III, 830);

for, 'if all ends in sleep and quiet rest, what bitterness is there in it so great that one could pine with everlasting sorrow?'

That death should seem the end of all things for this kindly philosopher, this man of fearless and relentless intellectual honesty, this poet soul haunted by all the beauty and pathos of the world, that is the pity of it. Is it any great strain upon our faith, hope, and charity to hold that his spirit has moved out beyond those *flammantia moenia mundi* of his song, to discover that life and reality are more than a dance of atoms in illimitable void and that there is a God who made all things and who gathers all true and valiant souls to His heart at last?

W. L. DOUGHTY

ADOLF SCHLATTER — DAS CHRISTLICHE DOGMA

Prayer

PRAYER is the act in which we turn our will to God. Hence it follows, that the fundamental activity in religion is prayer. To be religious is to pray; to be irreligious is to be incapable of prayer. The struggle for religion is the struggle for prayer. True prayer is true religion; corrupted prayer is perverse religion. The theory of religion is the philosophy of prayer.

Prayer is the most direct utterance of faith. When we turn with full intent our mind and will toward our Father in heaven: then and not until then do we experience the 'intensification to certainty' of a mere conception of God.

Prayer is likewise the most direct utterance of love. Hence the offering of ourselves, of mind and will, is the first oblation which we owe to God.

The initial act of all true prayer is adoration, as the act in which we unite ourselves with the divine purpose. Adoration teaches us to understand ourselves as the receivers of God's gift and at the same time as the agents of His purpose. Our prayer becomes thus of necessity an expression of gratitude and of petition. It can no longer be bent on mere reflection upon ourselves. Contemplation of the divine plan of the Universe becomes its essential characteristic.

The attempt, however, to eliminate altogether our own thoughts and experiences would not guarantee true prayer, because it would imply that God cannot suffer any exertion of will beyond His own. God does not ask for blind submission when He bids us to love Him. True love of God issues in the first instance in self-contemplating prayer which evokes, purifies, and confirms our own will, and leads us to an active obedience giving itself up as an instrument of the divine will, which is our aim and our joy.

Such prayer originating in the events of every day's life, demands of us both gratitude and supplication. Gratitude teaches us to see our individual life as a constituent part of the divine plan of the race, thus providing guidance for both mind and will. The spiritual disposition of gratitude transforms every event in our life into a potential revelation of God the Creator. If we give thanks for what we receive, we remember the Giver in each of His gifts, and we balance our judgement. To a thankful heart God reveals Himself as the actuating Mind in history. Gratitude leads us to finding God the Father in the events of our daily life. If we cease to be thankful we lose Him. Moreover, gratitude safeguards us from self-destructive greed, because it prevents the exploitation of the gift for the heightening of the Ego. It places us in our reception and enjoyment of it under the Lord of life who bestows the gift upon us: the action which went out from God returns back to its origin, which is Himself.

We do not live as receivers only. We are called upon to act, and before we can take any action we must make sure of our aim and means, that is to say, we must turn to God in supplication. From Him we ask insight and strength, when suffering is to be averted, or when duty and love call on us for sacrifice. Whenever we transform the desire of shaping the future according to our own devices into a prayer for obedience, we experience that cleansing of heart and deepening of insight which results from gratitude. Once more are we safeguarded against destruction through self-will. We give up determining the course of our action ourselves, and our decisions take shape in the presence of

God: we use our power to determine history by obediently accepting the divine plan, as God gives us to see it. Our personal decisions become morally correct precisely to the degree to which we subject our will to the directing power of objective moral truth. It is of the utmost importance for the right employment of our intelligence that we should attain to such moral integrity of will, because our intentions spring forth from our past actions and are continuously fed by them.

If we are inclined to disregard petition as compared with gratitude, we prove that we have fallen a prey to a false conception of God. We conceive of His Omnipotence as being incapable of tolerating freedom outside Himself. If we cannot and must not love nor will, all supplication is indeed mere deception.

Such scruples become more intensified as we grow conscious of the fact that our corrupt will in its selfish greed determines too often even the content of our prayer. We care for our own happiness so much more than for that of others. Are we then to overcome our evil will by abandoning all will, and our self-love by resigning all love? Certainly not. Sin and the predominant desire for personal happiness cannot be conquered by apathy. The purity or impurity of our desires is immediately reflected in our petition, an experience which teaches us how indispensable prayer is. We cease inevitably to fight our self-will if we give up measuring it with and confirming it in the will of God, that is to say, if we disregard supplication.

If we have come to know that an honest life must be a life of prayer, we have come to understand that prayer carries the greatest weight for our personal history. The power which adjusts us morally determines our attitude toward the events of our daily life. We become corrupt if we cease praying and so does our whole history, all that we experience and all that we do.

If we deny God our adoration we lose sight of His work in history and we deprive ourselves of His blessing. It is then but a small step to revolt against Him. Ingratitude makes us shallow, it robs us of life's value and it mars our future. The spirit in which we meet the new day is nurtured by the mood of the day gone by. Life, if taken in self-love, remains barren. Events happen, but they are no longer a revelation of God; there is nothing in them to deepen our spiritual insight and to draw us nearer to Him; on the contrary: we begin to lose Him. Only when we ask God to reveal His Son in us can we hold on to Him. That alone can guarantee for us a choice of purpose capable of being fulfilled by Him. Only when we prepare ourselves to be His instruments can we secure for ourselves His help. Whosoever is called upon to act is faced with this choice: to lead a life of prayer, or to turn away from God and to determine autonomously the course of history — his own and implicitly that of the race. But if we choose to do our work as God's servants prayer must needs become the source of our life: all right action needs supplication.

Prayer, on the other hand, does involve the danger of perverting our conception of God. In turning deliberately our mind to Him we experience that freedom of self-determination which marks all our decisions, and we may be led into supposing ourselves to be the source of it. This danger will be conquered if faith in God becomes the inner motive of our prayer. Such faith, because it is inspired by its object, commits us totally to God and we rise to Him only because He lifts us up. Praying in self-donative faith we experience the

heightening of personal value by which it is always accompanied and the increased power for action, which originates from it as a gift of God. He Himself has invested us with the right for offering adoration, gratitude, and petition. Faith is the gift of God and so is prayer which is rooted in faith. Faithful prayer is the very power by which we conquer our pride and obtain humility, because we give thanks for the good which we have received, and we ask for the strength to act in accordance with God's will. In committing ourselves to Him we are liberated from self, not in order to give up all will, but that we may find the motive of our action in His will.

If, on the other hand, we perceive of God in a way which makes prayer impossible, we are left with mere resignation and we lose both: our faith in Him and His love. In response to such an attitude the power of God can bind and absorb us, but it can never free us nor can it make us alive. No personal relationship can spring forth from it; our life remains dead to God and our existence devoid of all meaning for the realization of His kingdom. But such a perversion of man into naught must inevitably lead to pride. However much we meditate upon such nothingness, we retain our power of volition and we begin to expect from God the fulfilment of desires and the bestowing of gifts for which we have neither asked nor thanked.

The modern conception of the 'law of nature' and the 'causal nexus' has raised another difficulty typical for our time. Does not, it is said, the belief in the power of our supplication imply the fantastic claim of influencing the cosmic system? Is not prayer an act of world-negation, an attempt to break down the eternal order? All prayer, it is alleged, is fed by a crude belief in miracles.

The crucial question of our problem is this: can we and do we exercise will-power or not? If the law of nature does not permit of human volition, no supplication can be demanded of us. No intention of ours, no purpose, can escape the verdict of being illusion, and with it all prayer breaks down as self-deception.

But this is not what we experience. The reality on which our consciousness lays hold in prayer is of an altogether different nature. It assures us beyond doubt, that human will-power is a potent factor in the world-order, and that it can be brought into harmony with the cosmic system, which is so constituted as to admit of it. But if that is so, we are under the obligation of adjusting ourselves to that order, and the only way of adjustment open to us is the sacrifice of self-determination and the full committal to God of all our intentions and desires, so that He may confirm, uphold, and fulfil them. We do not presume to govern the universe by prayer, on the contrary, we strive to free ourselves from any such intentions by seeking to harmonize our will with the will of God.

We cannot cease to will. Hence it follows, that the fantastic illusion does not consist in the fact that we have faith in prayer. It consists in the failure to grasp the true meaning of prayer. In spite of all theories which deny man the power of volition we remain intensely concentrated upon self-determination, and vividly conscious of being capable of purpose. But we are entirely mistaken about the range and might of that capacity, if we assume that nature will submit to our will for no other reason than because it is *our* will. This is precisely what we are doing when we forbear our right and duty of offering supplications. We are not cursed with a blind will, which can exercise only a blind power over the

world of mind and matter. We are given the grace to understand God in His revelation and to obey *His* purpose.

Thus prayer does indeed surpass the cosmic order. Because it is addressed to God it cannot but affirm His omnipotence. But we misjudge its nature, if we conceive of it as postulating 'miracles' and denying the existence of settled laws. On the contrary, in acknowledging God's omnipotence we recognize those laws as His creation. How could we lose sight of them if we invoke Him who ordained them? Far, very far indeed, from dissolving the cosmic order, prayer alone enables us to accept it as a true reality, and to escape the atheistic misconception which falsifies both the universe and our position in it through replacing the Person of God by a mechanical order. Thus petitionary prayer does not demand of God any action contrary to His creation. Rather does it seek harmony with the universe as He has called it into being. But it surpasses mere nature because it is addressed to a person whose power transcends all the limits of nature and whose love is inexhaustible.

We have thus come to understand that prayer has no limitations from without. No calculations of its chances of fulfilment within a cosmic system can ever hope to deceive us on that point. But there is an end to its range and its power: it must subside where our faith ceases to be alive. Forced beyond that limit it is no longer a true relation to God but is in danger of becoming sin. We need not question that God in His omnipotence can grant even perverted prayer, which invokes Him in fear and doubt, or turns to Him in a stubborn demand. But whither do they lead us? Let us remember that faith alone carries the divine promise of a blessing on prayer. God's unbounded grace does not liberate us from the duty of purifying our thoughts, of worshipping Him in true surrender and not in sceptical uncertainty. We have been given an absolutely certain promise of His grace in Christ's sacrifice on the Cross, and that very perfection of love commits us to a perfect belief.

No doubt, we stand in need of such an absolute certainty. A promise depending on mind or matter would throw us back into the agony of suspense and despair, which can promote no trust. The very experience in a living communion of the person and power of Christ excludes the conception of faith as mere abstract thought, vaguely hovering over subjective requests, and issuing in arbitrary petitions. On the contrary, prayer becomes essentially the acceptance of those concrete relations between intent and event which are divinely destined to form its content — and therein lies its inward limitation. Supplication, if it is to remain pure, calls on us to ascertain its acceptability. To such a certainty we must become entitled. We need to know that the purpose of our prayer harmonizes with the divine purpose for ourselves in history.

But we need to know no more. Faith embraces in equal determination the certainty of God's grace for our personal life and the uncertainty about the means and ways in which it will be fulfilled.

Yet we can tear asunder this oneness in prayer of certainty and uncertainty. On the one hand we can imagine ourselves as gifted with perfect knowledge, as minds whose spiritual insight can determine by prayer the action of God. Thus, forgetting the distance between us and the divine Majesty and His unlimited power over us, we pervert our prayer into pride. On the other hand, we may regard ourselves as devoid of all understanding, we may shut our eyes to His

goodness and become guilty of ingratitude. Prayer becomes then a quarrel with God, a reproach, an experiment battling with Him to awaken Him, and to call Him to His duty.

Often enough prayer will not be granted, not so much because it may aim at bringing about results which are by their very nature dependent upon and subject to the physical law, but rather because it turns to a God whose will rules our lives. The expectation of any law-like regularity in the fulfilment of prayer is a fallacy, and it is equally wrong to attribute a denial of our petition to lack of faith: as if in the end we might yet be able to exercise compulsion over God. This would mean that man is subject to God only when he sins, but that he gains power over Him by adopting the right religious attitude. Such sinister thought casts prayer into the dark realm of sorcery. If the fulfilment of prayer is denied us, we experience that God stands above us, that He is greater than our thoughts and our will. But fruitless prayer is not futile prayer. It is still prayer with promise and still the channel of God's grace in its entirety. We shall for ever meet with a love more abundant and of greater perfection than our own hearts can hold; and though fulfilment may be denied us we experience goodness which surpasses all expectation. Hence God's 'NO' does not weaken but fortifies prayer. The life-giving truth of God's promise to prayer is eternally ours in the very act of praying, because it unites us with Him, and union with God is for us the greatest good, much greater than anything for which we may ask.

This is not to say that pious emotion is the ultimate and the only true object of prayer. That would once again imply a weakening of our will-power instead of its fortification. It would disintegrate our personality by separating from the actual course of our daily life a religiously tinged emotion. The first act which God demands from us is to seek union with Him. This is for us the most real experience exercising upon us the most powerful influence. We have nothing greater nor mightier than the union of our person with the Person of God.

The fruit of prayer becomes manifest in our inward and outward history. It results in spiritual events integrated into ordinary historical facts. As such they are common, bearing no mark to single them out as a sphere peculiar in itself. And yet, prayer remains one of the most prominent means by which we win from God and keep alive the certainty for our believing in Him. Often enough it breaks forth like a cry of nature and we know that this call for God is no mania, but the most exalted truth and the most sublime reason. In such spontaneous acts of prayer we experience that faith does not live by art or by force. We are open to God truly, inwardly; He lays hands on us in reality. This truth is confirmed in us whenever our prayer is granted, be it in a series of events which we can understand in its causal sequence, be it in one startling event which appears to us miraculous. Enough is granted to all prayer to maintain it alive, to prevent its dying away out of sheer futility.

Union in prayer with God implies union in prayer with the race. If we limit our prayer to ourselves, we lose both: man and God. We have lost beyond recovery the power for adoration, if nothing but our own emotion or action spurs us to pray. We can neither request God's grace nor thank for it. Selfishness is silent before God. Receiving and acting we embrace more, much more than our own personal life. We do not stand as individuals before God. In

condescending to one soul the Father commits Himself always to the whole race. Hence prayer becomes an historic action constituting union or disunion. True social community is equivalent to true personal union with God. A family is truly and perfectly at-one to the degree in which the members can unite in prayer. Where there is oneness in prayer there is the Church. She cannot stretch beyond this unity. She is identical in number with those Christians who can give themselves up to the Lord's prayer with such full intent, that the will of Jesus becomes their own will.

Such prayer requires solitude. God does not visit a soul in public. We must strictly comply with Jesu's warning about the destructive influence upon prayer of publicity and ostentation. Nothing but a complete withdrawal from man and world can secure true and full concentration of mind and soul upon God. We wait upon Him in silence and loneliness, devoid of worldly purpose and interest. That is prayer in the 'inner chamber'.

But we have not shut our neighbour out when we shut the door. Prayer in secret is prayer for him as for us. We give up purposing for him; we carry him with us in our heart, bare in need and poor in spirit — him and us — to the throne of God. The aim of God's grace is the salvation not of the individual soul, but of the race, and therefore common prayer carries a more certain hope of fulfilment. God's promise is given to His Church, whereby she is made mighty before her Lord.

Communion with God gives the power for persevering in prayer. But we do not comply with the command to pray without ceasing by withdrawing from the world and ceasing to work for our fellow men. That would be the surest way to silencing prayer. The motive for and the content of our prayer grow out of our daily duty. It is our work which keeps our will alive, and supplies our prayer with its inexhaustible themes. Our task is rather to maintain at the same time a living connexion with God and with our neighbour, without allowing the one relationship to be impeded by the other. At certain times our mind will be more completely turned to God, at others it will be more fully occupied with our fellow men. Such is the normal function of consciousness which to alter we must not attempt. Patient perseverance in faith will win us throughout the time of our earthly life an unbroken intercourse with God.

Such is for man the meaning and the might of prayer. It has power to save us from death — it has power to win us life. Therefore we can in no man find our Saviour and our Christ except in Him who in His name has authorized us to invoke His Father, and who has taught us how to pray.

Translated by MARGARETE STEINER

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

TOWARD the end of the first century of the Christian era, probably sometime between A.D. 70 and 85, to be more precise, there appeared a striking piece of Christian apologetic, which we know now as the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The people to whom this epistle was sent were evidently in danger of falling away from the Christian faith. The author of this letter seeks to hold his readers in allegiance to Christ, by presenting Christianity to them as the final religion, the religion which had fulfilled and realized what the former religion could only foreshadow.

The nature of this epistle is such as to lead one to conclude that it was intended for Jewish readers who were well accustomed to the Old Testament ritual, though this has been disputed by some very competent scholars.

There is an air of antiquity about this letter. The writer uses forms of thought which to our modern age seem remote, and at times hard to comprehend. But, despite its ancient setting, one cannot read this letter without gaining a very definite and a very exalted conception of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ.

Moreover, the relevance of this epistle to our age is more and more discernible. The emphasis upon realities, as opposed to types and symbols, is something which suits our practical age very well. The claim of this writer, that the deepest loyalty and devotion of the human heart are not to be pledged to some formal leader, but only to One who has won His credentials in the rigorous tests of daily life, is again in tune with modern sentiment. Again, 'Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken' (Hebrews xii. 28), despite much outward tumult and convulsion, are words very applicable to our present condition.

However much this epistle may have been neglected in the past, it is not likely, because of its intrinsic message, to be forgotten in the future.

THE DIVINITY OF THE SON

This epistle contains a very lofty conception of Christ. He is the Son of God. Because of His divine sonship, He is superior to prophets, angels, Moses, and Aaron. Because Christ is the son of God He is better able to reveal God to men. 'Who so fit to make God known as one who is related to Him as the sun's rays to the sun. . .?'¹

In the first verse of this epistle this writer asserts that Christ was the son of God. 'God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets . . . hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son . . .' (Hebrews i. 1). In addition to the anarthrous form, 'Son', the titles, 'the Son', 'The Son of God', 'the Firstborn', and the phrase, 'Jesus the Son of God', are used to describe Jesus. The Son is a divine personality who shares the nature, and character, and eternity of God. 'Who being the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance' (Hebrews i. 3), must mean that for this author, Jesus was, 'God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father'. As Theodoret says: 'To assert that the brightness of the Father's glory once did not exist, destroys also the original light of which it is the brightness; and if there ever was a time in which the image of God was not, it is plain that He whose image He is, is not always.'² Christ, according to this epistle, is a distinct person within the Godhead, who fully shares and reveals the nature of God. The divine being of the Son as portrayed by this writer has rarely been questioned, though Menegoz,³ author of *La Théologie de*

¹ *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II, 329.

² *Nairne Epistle of Priesthood*, p. 117 (T. & T. Clark).

³ *Nicene Library of the Fathers*.

L'Épître aux Hébreux, finds it impossible to recognize any confession of the essential divinity of Christ in the epistle.

The excellence of the Son's person is further described in that He is declared to be superior to the angels. 'Having become by so much better than the angels, as He hath inherited a more excellent name than they' (Hebrews i. 4). The angels are but servants of the divine will, but the Son has an everlasting kingdom. All the angels of God are bidden to worship him.

The Son is also superior to Moses. 'For He hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much as he that built the house hath more honour than the house' (Hebrews iii. 3). The fidelity of Moses was that of a servant, but Christ is a Son, over the house. Moses was the mediator of the Law, and the revealer of God's will under the Old Covenant. 'Probably the writer, like Philo, regarded Moses as really high-priest as well, though he delegated the functions of the office to Aaron.'¹ Christ as the mediator of the New Covenant, and the high-priest of our confession is superior to Moses.

THE SON IN RELATION TO THE WORLD

The Son is the agent of creation. He is the One through whom the worlds are made. At the same time the creation is finally referred to God. 'By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God' (Hebrews xi. 3). As Westcott² points out, the teaching of this epistle exactly corresponds with the Nicene phrases: 'I believe in one God, the Father . . . Maker . . . of all things, and in one Lord Jesus Christ . . . By whom all things are made.'

Philo, who has several affinities, with this epistle, discusses the relationship between God who is pure Being, and the world of becoming. The 'logos' is the concept which Philo used to bridge the gulf between the two. The 'logos' is for Philo, God's thought or reason, God's image, the agent of creation, and the divine seal by which each created thing is stamped.

But Philo's 'logos' lacks the individuality of 'the Son' as portrayed in the epistle to the Hebrews. 'He (Philo), sometimes speaks of 'logoi' in the plural with no more hesitation than when we speak indifferently of 'the law' or 'the laws' of nature. . . . The logos is the constitutive principle of human individuality, he is not himself an individual.'³

The Son, as described in Hebrews, is not only the agent of creation. He is also the sustainer of all created things. 'And upholding all things by the word of His power' (Hebrews i. 3). This writer was no deist. The Son is not 'an absentee God, sitting idle ever since the first Sabbath, at the outside of His universe, and seeing it go,'⁴ as Carlyle wrote. Rather, He is active in the preservation and direction of all created things.

Further, Christ is the heir of all things. Jesus spoke of himself as 'the heir' in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Matthew xxi. 38). He who created all things, appropriately inherits the same.

Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.⁵

The heirship of Christ implies the sovereignty of Christ over all things. The

¹ Peake, *Century Bible*, p. 114.

² Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 426 (Macmillan).

³ E.R.E., Vol. I, 311.

⁴ Sartor Resartus, Bk. II., ch. vii.

⁵ F. W. H. Myers, *St. Paul* (Allenson).

'world to come' is to be subjected to Him. Not yet do we see all things in obedience to Him. But already He has occupied the place of honour and rulership at God's right hand. Jesus claimed the words of Psalm 110, 'The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool,' as referring to Himself. When the high priest, Caiaphas, said unto Him, 'tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God', Jesus said unto him, 'Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven' (Matthew xxvi. 64). Christ is sovereign of the world which is to come.

THE INCARNATE LIFE OF THE SON

While there is little reference to the teaching of Christ in this epistle, and only one or two snapshots of His earthly life, nevertheless, the epistle does make a frank recognition of the real manhood of Jesus. Christ partook of the same flesh and blood as ordinary mortal men. 'Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren' (Hebrews ii. 17). Physically, emotionally, morally, spiritually, Jesus was made like other men.

Christ, says this author, has faced the discipline of temptation, 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin' (Hebrews iv. 15), and by so doing has gained sympathy with His fellow creatures in their struggle against evil. Furthermore, Christ's moral nature was developed through temptation. His limitations were opportunities for perfecting trust in God. It is not necessary to imply that there was ever a time in the life of Jesus, when He was imperfect, considering the point of life which He had then reached. But each new day brought with it new experiences of joy and sorrow, fresh possibilities of good and evil. By His choice of the good and His rejection of the evil His moral stature grew.

In addition, Christ has experienced the pain of human suffering. 'Who in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death...' (Hebrews v. 7), quite obviously a reference to our Lord's anguish in Gethsemane. One of the most baffling problems to Christian thinkers is the problem of suffering. Jesus did not escape that problem. The distress in human life, caused by bodily and mental weakness, was sympathetically noticed by Him as He moved among the people, and He did much to relieve that distress. In addition, at the last, His soul was greatly troubled, and His flesh was torn and bruised. His nature, like that of many another, was perfected through suffering.

It is all part of this writer's argument to point out the true humanity of Jesus. One of the features of his message is that a perfect priest must have, by experience, a full and true understanding of the lives of those for whom he ministers. In connexion with this, Milligan¹ shows that the human name Jesus, is used nine times in this epistle; viz: — (Hebrews ii. 9; iii. 1; vi. 20; vii. 22; x. 19; xii. 2; xiii. 12; xiii. 20).

Jesus was made like unto us in His descent after the flesh, in the opposition He encountered, in the intensity of His personal sufferings. We are human; so was He. We suffer; so did He. We die; so did He, 'endured the cross, despising the shame' (Hebrews xii. 2). The point at which He differed from us was, He knew no sin.

¹ G. Milligan, *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*.

THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

This is the main theme of this epistle. 'Now in the things which we are saying the chief point is this: We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man' (Hebrews viii. 1 and 2). Chapters five and seven to ten deal specifically with this theme.

It is under the office of priesthood that our author writes of Christ's redemptive work. As a starting point for his argument, he uses the analogy of the Levitical priesthood. Aaron, the brother of Moses, was the ancestor of all lawful priests, and was himself the first high priest. Aaron, and his sons, had been consecrated to the priesthood by Moses. But our author has no very high evaluation of the Aaronic priesthood and its functions. All the elaborate ritual of the Day of Atonement, the slaughter of bulls and goats, could not, he says, take away sin. These Levitical sacrifices offered annually could never make the worshippers perfect. They could sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, and under that semblance of atonement the high priest might venture on behalf of men to draw near to God. But such sacrifices could not purify the heart and conscience of men. They failed of their real objective, but they were a symbol of a nobler sacrifice which was to follow.

There was, however, this virtue in the Aaronic priesthood. It was of divine appointment. Aaron was called of God to this sacred office. He had not arrogated it unto himself.

But this author, in order to point to the superiority of Christ's priesthood, quotes not only the Levitical priesthood. He makes reference also to the priesthood of Melchizedek. He asserts that the priesthood of Melchizedek was greater than that of Aaron. In the first place, Melchizedek's priesthood was older than that of Aaron. Abraham, long before the days of Aaron, paid tithes to Melchizedek, and was in return blessed by Melchizedek. Furthermore, Melchizedek was not of the Israelite race, which fact implies a priesthood of wider scope than that of Aaron. In addition, a later writer, the author of Psalm 110, has hailed a certain prince, probably Simon the Maccabean prince, not only as secular ruler, but also as High Priest, though he was not in the Aaronic line of descent. 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' (Psalm cx. 4). This implies that the priesthood of Melchizedek has outlived the Levitical priesthood.

But the real point in this author's argument is not so much that the priesthood of Melchizedek is superior to that of Aaron, but rather that in the priesthood of Melchizedek we have a remarkable type of a divine and eternal priesthood. 'For this Melchizedek . . . King of righteousness . . . King of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually' (Hebrews vii. 1-3). Christ is a priest after this ideal type. 'He is', says Theodoret, 'without father as touching His humanity; for as man He was born of a mother alone. And He is without mother as God, for He was begotten from everlasting of the Father alone. And again He is without descent as God, while as man He has descent.'¹

But the perfection of Christ's priesthood is to be seen in that He offered upon

¹ *Nicene Library of the Fathers.*

the cross the perfect sacrifice for sins, a sacrifice that needs not to be repeated. 'Once for all, when he offered up himself' (Hebrews vii. 27), a full and sufficient atonement was made for the sins of men.

The treatment of sin by cleansing is a characteristic feature of the priestly books of the Old and New Testaments, and cleansing is always effected by shedding of blood. The culminating point of the ritual of the Day of Atonement, as observed under the Levitical system, was the moment at which the high priest entered the Holy of Holies, with the blood of the slain goat, with which to sprinkle the mercy seat, the place most closely associated with the presence of Yahweh, he thereby making atonement for the sins of the people, having first of all made atonement for his own sins by the sprinkling of the mercy seat with the blood of the slain bullock. In this way the nation's lost holiness was restored. Year by year, the high priest repeated this ceremony.

But Christ's sacrifice was of nobler quality. In the first place, it was a voluntary offering of Himself which He made upon the cross. He who had pre-existed with God from all eternity, 'did not prize too highly His equality with God'. He came to earth, He partook of our nature, He chose a certain path in life, which He probably foresaw would lead Him to the cross. After the martyrdom of John the Baptist, Jesus would know pretty well what was in store for Him if He continued in the same path. 'I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it is accomplished.' Jesus was not just the victim of circumstances when He died upon the cross. All the evangelists say that Jesus readily gave Himself to die for men. His death was no accident in His career. He had come to do the will of God, as He understood it, and when the divine will pointed to the cross, He voluntarily gave Himself for us.

Further, Christ's sacrifice was a holy one. There was no ethical quality in the blood of a slain lamb, compulsorily led to the slaughter. But Christ in His life and death was fully attuned to the holy will of God. During His life and ministry, His very presence had at times convinced men of sin. His refusal to compromise with evil, His victory over temptation in the wilderness, bespeak a life of matchless purity. The gracious words which fell from His lips taught men of their estrangement from God, and of their need to be put right with God. 'This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world,' was the testimony which the Samaritans paid to Him when they had heard His words. His spotless life was further revealed as He stood before His judges at the last. They could find no fault in Him.

But what has most impressed all Christian thinkers in their meditations upon the cross, has been the amazing love of Christ for men. 'He loved me and gave Himself for me,' said St. Paul. He whose heart had overflowed with sympathy for men during His ministry, now gave all it had to give, body, blood, life, its very self. Whereas the gods of the pagan religions had been fitful and capricious, and though there is little in the Old Testament about the love of God, here, in the death of Jesus, the love of God, and the love of Christ for men are perfectly revealed.

Furthermore, there was an eternal significance in the sacrifice of Christ. Our author looks backward and forward, and sees the cross an adequate atonement for the sins of all men, and for all time. It is universal in its efficacy, and timeless in its power. So he writes, 'how much more shall the blood of Christ, who

through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Hebrews ix. 14). Such an offering cannot be repeated says Milligan, because it never comes to an end. 'It is not the death of Christ that is offered, but the Life of Christ and that involves continuousness. What Christ offers is not just His death, but also His life.'¹ Milligan argues that there is nothing incongruous in the continuous offering of Christ of Himself at the throne of God, with the phrase 'once for all, when he offered up himself,' since what He offers, is Himself, not just His death, but also His life.

CHRIST'S PRIESTHOOD IN HEAVEN

It is noteworthy that the author of this epistle mentions the resurrection of Jesus only once, and that in the words of the now familiar benediction, 'Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of the eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be the glory for ever and ever.' But he refers to the exalted life of Jesus several times (Hebrews iv. 14; vi. 20; vii. 26; ix. 11 and 24). He refers also to the session on the right hand of God (i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2).²

The heavenly session of our Lord finds frequent description in the New Testament, but it is in this epistle where it finds its fullest development. The right hand of God was the place of rest, honour, sovereignty.

'Christ's heavenly session', says Tait, 'is a declaration of His heavenly glory, the permanence of His priesthood, the completion of His propitiatory work, and the scene of His consequent priestly ministration.'³

In this way, Christ is depicted as King-priest, a description unique in the New testament.

The Old Testament had two conceptions of the Messiah. Sometimes he is depicted as a suffering Messiah. At other times he is described as ruler and monarch. According to our author, Christ has united these two ideas in Himself. Through the sufferings of the cross, Christ has won His throne. 'We behold him . . . even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man' (Hebrews ii. 9).

The risen and glorified life of Christ as depicted in this epistle provides ample scope for meditation and investigation.

In the first place, where and what is heaven? Early Christian thought conceived heaven as a locality, where the sovereignty of God was unchallenged. There was no serious attempt to get away from this idea until the nineteenth century. Later reflection has conceived of heaven as a state or condition of mind and soul. A modern statement on heaven would probably say that it is a spiritual kingdom, the entrance into which lies open before men in this present life, though the full enjoyment of its blessings is only attainable hereafter.

Again, what is the precise nature of Christ's ascended life? Does Christ's

¹ Milligan, *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 142.

² Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 427.

³ A. J. Tait, *The Heavenly Session of our Lord*, p. 17.

intercession for us at the right hand of God imply that Christ is inferior to God? Arius thought it did. During the fourth century,¹ this was the interpretation generally put upon Christ's intercession. John of Damascus replied that the right hand of God implied equality with God, and that no degree of inferiority should be deduced from Christ's intercession. The intercession is not a sign of His inferiority, but a proof of His love.

The exaltation of Christ does evoke worship and reverence in the heart of the believer. The words of this epistle occupy a large place in our private and public prayers. Possibly only the book of Psalms, of all the books in the Bible, has enriched our devotional life more than this epistle.

Again, what is the intercession of our High Priest? Is it vocal prayer? Lutherans said: 'Intercession was *vocalis et realis*.'² The English Reformers generally followed the Lutheran conception of the intercession of Christ. Swete thought that the intercession of the ascended Christ was not a prayer, but a life. The mere presence of Christ with the Father, this is His intercession. Jeremy Taylor distinguishes between the completed offering on the cross, and the perpetual representation of it by Christ in heaven. This perpetual representation is the intercession. In short, Christ is continually pleading the merits of the one sacrifice offered upon the cross.

Westcott thinks that the High-priestly work of Christ does three things for us.³

- (1) Christ intercedes for men as their representative before God.
- (2) Christ brings the prayers and praises of His people before God.
- (3) Christ secures access for His people in their present state to the holy place where He Himself is, in His Blood. If we are in union with Christ, we may 'draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace', not on one day of the year only, but every day. These are the fruits of Christ's High-priestly sacrifice and intercession.

J. F. HUMPHREY

¹ A. J. Tait, *The Heavenly Session of our Lord*, pp. 149-52.

² A. J. Tait, *op.cit.*, p. 161.

³ Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 229.

SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER

AFTER millennia of struggle for human rights, the city named after the great man who opposed anarchy in Europe, built on seven hills, like Rome—the city which is the last Western exponent of Western civilization in the Western hemisphere—San Francisco, has become the birthplace of a constitution of United Nations, a 'Magna Carta' for nations and people, based on principles of human equality and determined

- ... to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights,
in the dignity and worth of the human person,
in the rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
- ... to establish conditions under which justice and respect for obligations ... can be maintained,
- ... to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom ...
- ... to practise tolerance and live together in peace. . . .¹

It is not an accident that this Charter was written here, at the geographical end of the West, the final stopping point of Western culture.

Some of the nations' delegates, while sitting in their apartments in the hotels, built on one of the city's seven hills, may have observed the purple sunset behind the beautiful Golden Gate and realized that this sunset was nothing else than a hand writing on the wall of Western civilization with the blood of all those who died for this Charter. It seemed to warn men that unless they shaped and adopted such a scheme the globe would be plunged into a new and darker night. It was perhaps clear to them that we cannot carry our democracy farther to the West, because in the middle of the distance between the American and Asiatic continent the East begins, and if the East takes over, then our role in world culture will come to an end. It is too early for this change of leadership, because the East is still not prepared to keep democracy alive. It may be mature after the next hundred years, but until that time we must fight for democracy and also help the East to fight for it. The delegates signed the world constitution in the hope that it will keep Western culture from sinking into oblivion.

In his message to the U.S. Senate, while submitting the San Francisco Charter, President Truman characterized the situation in the words: 'The choice is not between this charter and something else. It is between this charter and no charter at all.' These words must be remembered during the whole analysis of the San Francisco achievements.

The problem overwhelming all other in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals was the question of keeping peace by means of a police force. The other purposes were indicated in Chapter 1 of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as their background, but rather ideologically sketched than substantially constituted. This is not the case in the San Francisco Charter. In Chapter 1, essential additions were made. The principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as well as fundamental freedoms for all without distinction of race, sex, language, and religion were added in a form grading them as of

¹ Preamble of the San Francisco Charter.

equal importance with the problem of keeping security. In other words, the San Francisco Charter presents a shift from the tendency to repress world troubles by police force to an effort to prevent troubles at their sources by securing the basic human rights given to mankind by divine law. It reflects clearly that the Big Three one-sided decision of Dumbarton Oaks, to have peace at any price, was balanced by the smaller nations' endeavour to make understandable what all people expect from a world-wide co-operation, namely the 'improvement of economic, social, and spiritual mutual relations'. Thus the platform and range of the organization were substantially enlarged by the San Francisco Charter.

The principles were stated more clearly in article 2 of the Charter than they were in the proposals:

- (1) by the elimination of the objected 'peace-loving' qualification of the members;
- (2) by the addition of the moral quality of 'good faith' which is a legal idiom taken from Roman law (*bona fides*);
- (3) by the insertion of the word 'justice' along with peace and security;
- (4) by a sharper definition of the use of force 'against the territorial integrity or political independence'.

However, the above principles were nullified or at least considerably weakened at the end of article 2 by point 7, which under certain circumstances may cause much harm. We know from experience that some nations entrenched themselves behind internal problems, subject to the sovereign jurisdiction of the state, in order to avoid responsibility for such incidents as the murder of Matteotti and other socialists in 1922 by Mussolini, who eliminated any opposition inside the country by terror. The 'Reichstag process' in 1933 was an attempt to uproot the socialists, communists, and liberals in Germany, and the Nuremberg anti-Jewish 'laws' were devised to provide a smokescreen for world conquest. It is a matter of fact that all international disasters start with internal evils and troubles. We cannot avoid international troubles if we allow internal wrong. Point 7 of article 2 is the ostrich-like policy of the United Nations attempting to hide problems which must inevitably come to the fore. We can never have world democracy if the United Nations refuse to save democracy in any particular country.

Point 7 of article 2 neutralizes the above-mentioned improvements in purpose stated in article 1, and interferes with the principle 'or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations' (article 2, point 4), stultifying the better part of the preamble, reducing it to mere words and impractical wishes. This is underlined by the last paragraph of article 2, point 7: 'but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII' (threats and breaches of the peace and acts of aggression). This means, in other words, that in case of threats and breaches of the peace and acts of aggression the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs is waived. Conversely (*argumentum a contrario*) in all other cases an intervention in internal affairs is not allowed.

In this way the general high-sounding principles of human rights are made non-existent by the principle of non-intervention in domestic affairs. This

addition, which is incompatible with the spirit of the Conference and Charter, nullifies the general rule of the elimination of any inconsistency, because a specially expressed rule is always an exception to the general rule (*lex specialis derogat lex generalis*). The preponderance of politics over justice and legal thought is seen again in this case. There cannot be any 'internal problems' which, if 'inconsistent and conflicting with human rights and fundamental freedoms', should be tolerated. If they happen, everybody from the Big Five down to the Axis partners — the latter not admitted to the United Nations for the moment — must be sure that they are a *casus belli* and the United Nations will react immediately.

If we had sent five bombers on Rome in 1922 after Matteotti was murdered, there would have been no war. The same would be the case if we had sent another five bombers to kill 'the drunken soldier' who caused the Manchurian campaign because of a 'neighbourhood border dispute', and so we could have finished Hitler if we had sent five bombers to Nuremberg in 1933 or during the 'Reichstag process' to Berlin. These were all 'domestic affairs'. It is not enough in such cases for correspondents of some newspapers in democratic countries to rend their garments, protest, and lament about it. The devil does not understand democratic expressions of public opinion and does not heed them. The *New York Times* and *San Francisco Chronicle* copyrighted story from Stockholm on 1st July 1943, says that Ribbentrop managed to convince Hitler and Goering that the British were bluffing in 1939, that Britain would never go to war over Poland and the Polish war would prove only 'a local affair' with no further consequences. Such incidents must be avoided beforehand by the expressed determination of the United Nations to use force against 'local affairs' and 'internal questions' if necessary.

The conditions of membership are stated in four detailed articles of Chapter II, which replace the eleven-words definition of Chapter III in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. These four articles limit the right of original membership to those nations who either signed the United Nations' declaration of 1st January 1942, or joined the organization during the San Francisco Conference and ratify the Charter according to article 110, leaving the membership at the same time open to all 'peace-loving' states which:

- (a) accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and
- (b) are both able and willing to carry them out.

The General Assembly decides upon the recommendation of the Security Council about the ability and willingness of the new applicants.

Chapter II also contains rules about suspension, restoration of membership rights, and expulsion of members, subject to the combined jurisdiction of the General Assembly and Security Council in the first and third cases and solely to the Security Council in the second case. It is remarkable that they were established by the same delegates who pushed through as original members some nations which did not respond to either of the two criteria of ability and willingness.

In Chapter III the Trusteeship Council and the Economic and Social Council were added as organs equal in importance to the General Assembly,

the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. The Charter limits the number of representatives in the General Assembly to five for each member nation.

The rights of the General Assembly, which under normal conditions should be the legislative body of the world organization, are very abstract. The General Assembly is authorized to 'discuss' (articles 10 and 11, point 2), 'consider' (article 11, point 1), 'make recommendations' (articles 10 and 11, point 2), 'call the attention' (article 11, point 5), 'be notified by the Secretary' (article 12, point 2), and 'initiate studies' (article 13, point 1). Such kind of rights as has e.g. a university, a private institution, or a citizens' forum.

Only in one case has the General Assembly the right to decide or to 'approve', namely, in the case of the budget. It is true that the budget is a very strong weapon. However, it is only a weapon of defence. If the General Assembly is dissatisfied, disappointed or annoyed it will disapprove or at least protest in approving the budget.

Too often we have heard in the last years that we are looking for co-operation of governments and states, but not for a super-government. We would like to have something big, overwhelming any evil, and securing peace all over the world, yet we will give up nothing of our independence, sovereignty, and self-determination. With this reservation nothing else could result than what was accomplished. If we will not grant to the world organization the right of limiting the sovereignty of particular states then this makes the United Nations merely a formal organization, but does not make the General Assembly its main organ.

Grotius in his *De iure belli ac pacis* offers a system fundamental to the development of international law and international relations and, with some amendments, it could be accepted today. Since his time more than three hundred years have passed and the behaviour of the aggressor nations during the last twenty-five years was worse than at the time of Grotius. After all the big wars of these three centuries, we reached the stage of the League of Nations, an institution which should have exercised Grotius' legal system of international affairs, and this institution failed. It is a remarkable phenomenon that no one had found any essential error in the system of Grotius, and despite this no effort was made to adapt it. The system is not wrong, but rather the people are either bad or not yet mature enough to carry out the genial idea of a humanist, born in the sixteenth century, and to accomplish the task outlined by him.

The main faults of the League of Nations were its lack of power to execute its decisions and the unanimity of its voting. Now we must patiently go stage by stage. Our generation is manifestly not yet ripe to skip one step in the long way to a world government based on democracy. From nationalism, the road through internationalism may lead us to cosmopolitanism, a world citizenship.

Regional arrangements are allowed in the Charter as far as they do not interfere with the world organization; they also may be used by the Security Council for the settlement of regional problems, subjected to its approval.

In their political character, shape, and tendency, the provisions about the non-self-governing territories and the international trusteeship system are similar. Chapter XI outlines the duties of a colonial government, Chapters XII and XIII define the trusteeship system (previously mandates).

The trusteeships are divided into strategic and non-strategic areas (article 82); the first submitted exclusively to the Security Council, the second formally in the jurisdiction of the General Assembly (article 85, point 1), but in fact under the jurisdiction of a special body (article 86). The provisions are logical and satisfactory. The experiment of trusteeship might be used as a training school for international administration for the future cosmopolitan super-government.

The International Court of Justice is in its construction the most democratic organ in the institution, because it is compulsory to all members of the United Nations (article 94, point 1) and is open to non-members, subject to the decision of the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council (article 93). The sentence of the Court may be executed if necessary (article 94, point 2). On the other hand it does not exclude all the extra-judicial means of settlement of disputes, such as negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, etc. (articles 33 and 95). The compulsory competence of the Court, as defined in article 36 of the Statute annexed to the Charter, is limited to the following legal disputes:

- (a) interpretation of a treaty,
- (b) any question of international law,
- (c) the existence of any breach of an international obligation,
- (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

There is one big gap in the whole constitution. The San Francisco Charter deals chiefly with formal law, while material law is completely neglected. Very little is said about codification of private and public international rights in war and peace. Article 13 foresees that 'the General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of . . . encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification'.

Article 96, point 1 mentions the right of the General Assembly or the Security Council to request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on legal questions. If we are afraid of working a system of international law, we shall never achieve peace. The organs of any institution must know what the law is, in order to be able to decide who is right and what is to be done in particular cases. The rights and the crimes must be defined to be understood by the police force.

The lack of any decision on the codification of international law proves that the San Francisco Charter is a political document. But people are tired of politics and would like to have a legal order in the world. The literature and the archives of the universities all over the world have such a wealth of 'recommendations' that nothing new could be recommended. The Hague Court has had many years' experience in the field of international law. The only thing to be done is to compile, systematize, and to give legal sanction to those 'recommendations' by the legislature, in our case the General Assembly.

The Secretariat is the administrative body. The articles concerning it consist of routine rules. The only thing which could be objected to is that the Secretary-General has not only the right (article 99), but above all the duty, to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his

opinion might threaten international peace and security. The word 'may' should be replaced by 'shall'. His responsibility should be emphasized above his rights.

The most important body is the Economic and Social Council (Chapters ix and x). It is the only organ under the immediate authority and responsibility of the General Assembly (article 60). The Council consists of eighteen members. The rule (article 61, point 2) enables a member whose tenure is coming to an end to be re-elected. That is very valuable because before a new member understands the problems and procedure the time of his tenure is wellnigh over. As long as he proves his ability, efficiency, and character he should not be replaced.

If this international instrument is to work efficiently we must have skilled and experienced people and not dilettante, who change every few years. We need in world affairs long-range programmes. The only reason for change should be the inability of the member. One who is capable, efficient, and honest, and who proves his understanding of the highest ideals of mankind, as expressed in the preamble of the San Francisco Charter, and is willing to devote himself to the service of the highest authority, in the world, should remain working as long as he can.

The purpose of the Economic and Social Council is stated in the leading article of Chapter ix (article 55). It is its duty to promote:

- (a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social development,
- (b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational co-operation, and
- (c) Universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

In the centuries-long fight for equal rights 'without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion' the Charter states that the duty of the organization is to promote these ends. No charts and constitutions and no security councils and police force will help, if common men will not understand that the world is for all without distinction and carry out the principle in daily life.

For these fundamental rights many fought and died through the centuries. Their blood challenges the diplomats writing the context of the San Francisco Charter.

I have a letter written on 18th March 1945, i.e. five weeks before the San Francisco Conference started. A twenty-two-year-old paratrooper addressed this letter to his parents and his younger brother, but it was written as an appeal not only to the Conference members, but to all people. This boy was not afraid to fight and to die for the ideals defined more than two months after his death. He did not hesitate to fight for them although he could easily have avoided it. After his graduation with honours from the Chemistry Department of the University of California, two of his professors proposed that he stay with them and work on research for war chemicals, which work involved his deferment from military service. He refused the suggestion, desiring to fight actively and volunteered for the U.S. Army. He was attached to the artillery, but volunteered for the paratroopers and then for the demolitioners. He had the

chance to enrol in the Officers' Candidate School for Intelligence Service, but he volunteered to go to Europe. There he received the assignment to be bodyguard of the Headquarter Commander, but he volunteered for front-line action, took part in the air offensive of the U.S. 17th Airborne Division over the Rhine, in which he was severely wounded on 30th March, and died of wounds on 6th April 1945.

Five days before the big Rhine offensive he wrote:

... I am not afraid of anything and I do not worry about myself. I am fighting and working for my ideals and believe that God will help me. My ideal is that all people are individualities and should be treated as such, regardless of their origin, understanding of God, and appearance. That is my faith, ideal, and religion, and the goal of my life is to do whatever I can to spread that faith among people, so that finally everybody may recognize that truth and unite as citizens of the world and live together in friendship, so that the ideals of peace on earth, good will toward everyone, and brotherhood among men should become realism in the life, thoughts, and deeds of men.

The battle against the Germans is only one part of the battle against Fascism, hate among people, and all evil in the minds and hearts of men, but if we do not win this part of the battle, the whole struggle will be lost for centuries. In this part of the battle we are fighting so that those of us who believe in what I believe may live according to their ideals and try to spread them among men.

I believe that God will help and bless me so that I may do much good. I have a strong faith in God, in my own strength, and in the truth that the good in people will triumph and the world will be good, and life a wonderful, true, realistic dream.

Believe in this and work to speed its realization. Remember, Rysiek,¹ about this, about our parents, and friends.

The length of life and its happiness do not depend on the amount of time spent on earth, but upon how much good and happiness one has contributed to the lives of other people, and upon how true one has remained to oneself and to that which one sincerely believes.

I believe in equality of men before God and that brotherhood and good will toward all men must triumph in the world.

This boy, as so many others, fought and died for the highest ideals of humanity and democracy. His blood wrote the preamble and Chapter 1 of the San Francisco Charter. His name was Jerzy S. Spitzer. He was my son.

TADEUSZ B. SPITZER

¹ Rysiek is the name of the boy's younger brother.

Notes and Discussions

PAPIAS AND THE ELDER JOHN

A MAIN source of doubt regarding the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is the statement of Papias about the 'Elder John', as recorded in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* (iii, 39), and the further statement attributed to him by later writers about the alleged martyrdom of the Apostle John 'by Jews'. It is my object in the present article to submit these statements to a close examination, in order to determine how far they affect the traditional view.

Papias was probably born about A.D. 65. In his later life he became Bishop of Hierapolis, and was martyred about A.D. 135. Irenaeus (who died, an old man, in A.D. 202) says that Papias was 'a hearer of John (obviously meaning the Apostle), a comrade of Polycarp, a man of the old times'. Eusebius considers him a man of limited intellect; and if the chief quotation which Eusebius gives is any criterion, he was singularly unsuccessful in making himself understood. His principal work was entitled *An Interpretation of the Sayings of the Lord*, for which he drew, not on the written Gospels, but on oral traditions which could, he thought, be traced to the Apostles. This work was probably written between A.D. 115 and 120, though some have placed it — less probably, I think — as late as A.D. 145. Eusebius quotes this extract from the preface:

'I will not hesitate to add also to my own interpretations, thus confirming their truth, everything that in former times I carefully learned from the elders, and carefully stored in memory. For, unlike the many, I used to take pleasure, not in those saying many things, but in those teaching what is true; and not in those relating strange precepts, but in those relating the precepts given to the Faith by the Lord, handed down from the Truth itself. And if perchance anyone who had consorted with the elders should come, I used to make inquiry as to the words of the elders — what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James; or what John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; and the things which Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say (ἀ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν). For I thought that things learnt from books benefited me less than those learnt from the living and continuing voice.'

Let us examine this extract in detail. In the first place, most of it clearly relates to the somewhat distant past. It speaks of things which Papias learned *in former times* and *carefully stored in memory*: he *used* to take pleasure in those teaching what is true, and he *used* to inquire as to the words of the elders, when any came who had consorted with them; for it was his *habit of mind* to regard things learnt from living persons as better than things learnt from books. In fact, the attitude which he expresses is that of a *young* man, and the times referred to are those when oral tradition was still fresh. Thus, the closing years of the first century are suggested.

Nevertheless, written sources were available, and some at least of these were our Gospels, or something like them. Papias certainly knew Mark's Gospel, for in a well-known passage quoted by Eusebius he describes how (according to 'the Elder') the Gospel came to be written. He also knew the *Logia* of Matthew, which must have been one of the sources of our Gospel. And there are suggestions that he also knew the Johannine writings. The order in which the Apostles are mentioned is the same, so far as it goes, as that adopted in the Fourth Gospel (chapter i). And the expression 'the Truth itself' is not only reminiscent of the Johannine writings generally, but actually appears in the Third Epistle (verse 12). Eusebius expressly states that Papias used John's First Epistle. These indications are confirmed by the so-called Anti-Marcionite Prologue to the Fourth Gospel (probably dating from A.D. 160-80),

which states that the Gospel 'was published and given to the churches by John while still living in the body (obviously meaning when near the end of his life), as stated by Papias the Hierapolitan, a dear disciple of John'.

Next let us inquire how far the use of the present tense 'say' (*λέγουσιν*) in the latter part of the extract differentiates the matters therein referred to from those mentioned in the earlier part. The change of tense doubtless has a real significance. The things which Andrew or Peter said (*εἶπε*) belong to the past: those said by the Elder John belong to what may be regarded as the present. Eusebius interprets Papias as claiming to have received the sayings of the former group from those who had consorted with them, but to have been himself a hearer of Aristion and the Elder John. This is possible, but the words by no means necessarily imply it. Nor do they, I think, necessarily imply that Aristion and the Elder John were living when Papias wrote, though they may well have been living when he was collecting materials for his work. If the present *λέγουσιν* is to be pressed beyond this in contradistinction to the past *εἶπε*, one may reasonably ask why the past *εἶπε* is used (as it is) with reference to 'the Elder' in the passage above referred to concerning Mark's Gospel. Possibly, however, the preface was written before the rest of the work.

A more crucial question is the meaning of the term 'elders': 'everything that in former times I carefully learned from the *elders*'; 'if perchance any one who had consorted with the *elders* should come, I used to make inquiry as to the words of the *elders* — what Andrew or what Peter said', etc., and finally its use in the singular in the expression 'the Elder John'. The natural conclusion is that the expression 'the words of the elders' is in apposition to the sentence 'what Andrew or what Peter said', etc., and hence that the term 'elders' covers the Apostles. Nay, one may go farther, and conclude that it is Papias's ordinary term for the Apostles, since, so far as we know, he used no other. The term 'elder' had, of course, already assumed a special connotation in many Christian communities; but there is nothing in its original meaning to render it inappropriate for denoting the Apostolic group.

The only alternative seems to be that Papias, in his reference to things learnt from the elders, means things learnt at *third hand* from those who had consorted, not with the Apostles themselves, but with men who had known the Apostles and in a sense been their disciples. In that case we might paraphrase him as saying: 'If perchance anyone should come who had consorted with persons who had known the Apostles, I used to make inquiry as to the words of those persons — what information they could give concerning the sayings of Andrew, Peter,' etc. Such an interpretation would obviously be extremely awkward and unnatural.

Curiously, Streeter (*Primitive Church*), while agreeing that the term 'elders' in the plural is used by Papias to cover the Apostles, thinks that it would be another matter altogether for him to use the term in the singular to denote the Apostle John. One can only wonder why.

This brings us to the interpretation which Eusebius himself puts on the passage. After referring to Irenaeus's statement that Papias was a hearer of the Apostle John, Eusebius on the strength of the preface takes on himself to correct Irenaeus in this particular, saying that Papias 'by no means shows himself to have been a hearer or eye-witness of the Apostles'. Then he points out that Papias mentions the name 'John' twice — once in connexion with the names of the other Apostles, and once after the name 'Aristion'. He goes on to say that this tends to confirm his belief that there were two notable Christians named 'John' in Asia, and he mentions further that he has heard that there are two tombs at Ephesus bearing the name 'John'. He thinks, too, that if the Apocalypse was not written by the Apostle John, it may well have been written by the other John.

In these remarks Eusebius is clearly drawing on Dionysius of Alexandria (martyred

A.D. 265), who, in one of the acutest pieces of literary criticism that have reached us from antiquity, gives reasons for thinking that the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John are not from the same hand as the Apocalypse, and incidentally says he has heard that there are two tombs at Ephesus bearing the name of John.

Conservative critics like Chapman and Nolloth think that Eusebius is wrong in supposing that Papias speaks of *two* Johns: there was only one famous Christian of the name, namely the Apostle, as all other writers until Dionysius supposed: Papias indeed mentions John along with the other Apostles, as the source of 'interpretations' which had reached him indirectly; and again as a living and continuing voice in his own district of Asia Minor — living and continuing, at least, when he was collecting his materials: but in spite of the two references there was only one John.

Bacon, recognizing a difficulty, would remove it by amending the text. He would make Papias describe Arision and the Elder John, not as disciples of *the* Lord, but as disciples of *these men* (i.e., of Andrew, Peter, and the rest) — substituting *τούτων* for *τοῦ κυρίου* (in the abbreviated form *τοῦ κοῦ*). I can see little point in this emendation. It might have some point if Papias had previously been speaking of information derived *at third hand* from those who had consorted with disciples of the Apostles, and was here speaking of information derived from persons who had themselves known the Apostles; but I have already pointed out the extreme unnaturalness of such an interpretation.

At this stage we may inquire what is known from other sources concerning Arision and the 'Elder John' (regarded as other than the Apostle). The only references to an Arision (or Ariston, or Aristo) who might conceivably be the person in question seem to be in the Apostolic Constitutions, where an Arision is mentioned as an early Bishop of Smyrna (before the end of the first century), and in an Armenian manuscript of the Gospels dated 989, which attributes the longer ending of Mark to 'Aristo the Elder'. Streeter (*Primitive Church*), who is unable to accept the Petrine authorship of the first Epistle attributed to Peter, 'guesses' that it may have been written by Arision of Smyrna, largely on the ground that the writer speaks of himself as 'an eye-witness' of our Lord's sufferings, and that Papias's Arision was 'a disciple of the Lord' — surely a weak reason for identifying the two men. As regards the Armenian manuscript, Bacon suggests that the attribution of the longer Marcan ending to Papias's Arision arose from the fact that a person named Aristo was secretary to a Mark who was Bishop of Jerusalem in the second century! Similarly, we know nothing independently of Papias's 'Elder John', unless he be the person who calls himself 'the Elder' in the second and third Epistles attributed to the Apostle John — and then we are back at the point where we started: were there two Johns or only one?

If Papias's 'Elder John' is identical with 'the Elder' of these Epistles, he was obviously a man of importance in the churches of Asia Minor. If he wrote not only these Epistles, but the first Epistle and the Gospel also, Papias must have been aware of the fact. In that case he must have been, in Papias's view, an extremely important person. In Streeter's words, he was a man 'who was held in special veneration as a "disciple of the Lord"' (which must at least mean one who had himself seen the Lord), and was so notable that he could be spoken of simply as "The Elder", as one to whom that title belonged *par excellence*. Assuming this individual to be the author of the Johannine epistles, the personal authority which the writer takes for granted, the description of himself as "The Elder", and the attachment to the writings of the name John are all satisfactorily explained' (*Primitive Church*, p. 91).

The more this is realized, the more difficult it is to accept Eusebius's idea of two Johns. It is incredible that the Christian writers of the second century who mention — some of them in much detail — a famous John living at Ephesus about the end of

the first century or the beginning of the second, should fail to mention the striking fact that there were two of them. Nor does it say much for Eusebius's critical acumen that he should have believed in the existence of a noteworthy 'Elder John', distinct from the Apostle, and yet should have deemed it unnecessary to give a single word of explanation as to why he so unquestioningly attributed the Gospel and the first Epistle to the other John.

No! If we assume that Papias's 'Elder John' was not the Apostle, we must, I think, further assume that he, and not the Apostle, was the John known so well to Polycarp — spoken of so glowingly by Irenaeus, Leucius, and the rest — 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' — the disciple 'who leaned on the bosom of the Lord', as writes not only Irenaeus, but also Polycrates, himself an early Bishop of Ephesus, who incidentally mentions that this same John is buried there. In that case, he becomes a much more important figure than the son of Zebedee; but in that case, also, it becomes extremely difficult to find room for him among the characters of the New Testament.

Another point: why does Papias put the name of Aristion before that of the Elder John? Streeter, as we have seen, while admitting that the term 'elders' covers the Apostles, thinks, for some unexplained reason, that Papias cannot have spoken of an individual Apostle as an elder. And then he proceeds: 'But granted that it were linguistically possible, what about Aristion? He is mentioned as a "disciple of the Lord", on a par with and actually *before*, the Elder John; was Aristion, then, as an authority for the teaching of Christ, the equal, or even the superior, of the Apostle?'

But, as we have just seen, if the Elder John was not the Apostle, he must have been an even more important figure. The difficulty indicated by Streeter regarding the order of the names therefore still remains. It is a real difficulty: can it, perchance, be removed by an emendation of the text?

I have already mentioned Bacon's proposed emendation, and suggested that it has little point. But this is not to say that the passage may not be textually corrupt. Indeed, different readings in Greek manuscripts, and in Syriac and Armenian versions, clearly tend to show this. Can it possibly be that an adjective (*ἀριστος*) has been mistaken for the name of a person? Is it entirely unreasonable to suppose that Papias, after mentioning his inquiries as to the words of the other Apostles (Elders), went on to refer to the things which were being said by one who was the *best* authority, even John, the disciple of the Lord, and *par excellence* the Elder? May he not, in fact, have written some such words as these: *ἀ τε ὁ ἀριστ* — (a usual abbreviation) *ὦν καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης ὁ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῆς λέγει* (viz.: and the things which he who is the best, even the Elder John, the disciple of the Lord, says)? The Greek would not be good, but this would be in keeping, for Papias did not apparently write very good Greek. Once *ἀριστ* — *ων* had been changed to *Ἀριστων* or *Ἀριστιών* as a proper name, the rest would be natural and easy. The concluding words would have to be put into the plural; and at the same time the name John might have been added to the earlier list of the Apostles, from which it might at first have been omitted.

It may be objected that Eusebius states that Papias gives certain 'interpretations derived from Aristion and other traditions of the Elder John'. But Eusebius mentions no specific point derived from Aristion; and this may be merely a statement in general terms based on the previous conjunction of the two names. Or Papias may, in fact, have given interpretations derived from Ariston of Smyrna, and this very circumstance may have influenced the copyist in substituting the name for the adjective.

But whether or not such an emendation is justified, enough has, I think, been said to show that Papias's preface need not be regarded as vitiating the traditional view that the source of the Fourth Gospel was John the Apostle. It remains to examine the statement attributed to him about the martyrdom of the Apostle by Jews.

One version of this story appears in the writings of Philip of Side (fifth century), and reads: 'Papias in his second book says that John the theologian (*ὁ θεολόγος*) and James his brother were killed by Jews.' Another appears in a ninth-century writer, and reads: 'John was deemed worthy of martyrdom, for Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis, being an eye-witness, says in the second book of the *Logia* of the Lord that he was killed by Jews.'

Eusebius does not mention the story. According to the authorities whom he quotes, the Apostle John, after his return from Patmos, lived for some time at Ephesus, where ultimately he 'fell asleep'. Details of this 'falling asleep' are given in Leucius's 'Acts of John', usually dated about A.D. 150. The traditional view is that he died a natural death; but there is no inherent impossibility in the statement that he was killed by Jews, for the active hostility of the Jews to Christians continued long after this period. But whether the story is trustworthy is another question. To me it seems impossible that Eusebius — so eager to give information about the Apostles, and acquainted, as he seems to have been, with Papias's work at first hand — should have failed to mention it had it appeared in his copy of that work. Both versions of the story may well have come from a common source, and this may have been textually corrupt. Recently, Bardsley (*Reconstructions of early Christian Documents*) has found evidence in an early redaction of the 'Acts of John' that what Papias really said (commenting on Matthew xx. 23) was that 'John had the mind of a martyr and drank the cup of suffering'.

But suppose we accept the story: what then? It cannot be that John and James were killed *at the same time*, for, according to Acts xii. 2, James the brother of John was killed by Herod Agrippa senior (i.e. before A.D. 44 at the latest); whereas, according to Galatians ii. 9, John, along with Peter and James 'the Lord's brother', was a pillar of the church at Jerusalem when Paul visited it some years later. Moreover, the later version of the story says that Papias was an eye-witness, which seems to fix the place of John's death as in Asia Minor, and the date as not earlier than the closing years of the first century; while the use of the term *θεολόγος* in the earlier version is highly significant, for it obviously refers to the author of the Fourth Gospel. Hence it is clear that the writer of neither version saw anything in the story inconsistent with the traditional view concerning the Apostle John and his writings, save in the minor point that he was killed by Jews instead of dying a natural death.

It is perhaps worth while to emphasize that there is nothing improbable in the view that the Apostle lived until the end of the first century or the beginning of the second. He was doubtless a very young man when he first became a disciple. He was clearly younger than his brother, and neither of them can have been other than young — else it would not have fallen to their mother to bring them to Jesus and prefer on their behalf the request mentioned in Matthew xx, 20-1. Doubtless, too, it was largely owing to his youth that he became 'the disciple whom Jesus loved', and that he 'leaned upon the bosom of the Lord'. If it be objected that Jesus, on the cross, committed His mother to John's care, and that John thenceforth took her to 'his own home', the answer is that the home to which he took her was that of his own mother, with whom he himself lived. Incidentally, this element of youth supplies an answer to the curious objection that (notwithstanding the certificate of identity at the end of the Gospel) the author could not possibly have called himself 'the disciple whom Jesus loved', since this would have been contrary to modesty and good taste. Taste is notoriously an individual matter; but to me there seems to be nothing contrary to good taste or modesty if an old man, recounting the events of his youth, and recalling the intimacy which had existed between his Divine Master and himself, should have spoken of himself, with a somewhat whimsical tenderness, as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved'.

One last word. The conclusion which we seem to have reached is that, so far as Papias is concerned, there is no obstacle to the traditional belief as to the source of the Fourth Gospel. But I would not be regarded as suggesting that it matters at all to our Christian faith whether the Gospel originated with the Apostle John, or with another John, who was an actual disciple of the Lord, and an eye-witness of the events he describes.

F. J. BROWN

AND CAN IT BE?

'AND can it be that I should gain' has often been termed the national anthem of Methodism, and it has many claims to this title. Much of its popularity has undoubtedly been due to the tune 'Sagina', which has lent itself to typical Methodist fervour at great gatherings and with enthusiastic Sunday evening congregations; but a hymn which was written by Charles Wesley at the time of his conversion, which was frequently sung by the Wesleys and their early preachers, and lines from which were quoted on the deathbed of John Wesley, has obvious claims to the central place in Methodist song.

Its worth, however, does not rest on either its tune or its historical and sentimental associations; for it can be shown, I believe, to be a poem of great merit, not only in power and meaning but also in technical excellence. It is worth our examination in some detail.

It was first published in 1739 in *Hymns and Sacred Poems* under the title of 'Free Grace'. Its fifth verse has been omitted from the present Methodist Hymn Book, either because its theology appears awkwardly expressed to modern ears, or to achieve a more dramatic ending. To me the omission appears wise, though it may be that Wesley felt the artistic need of a quiet, intensive period between the exciting climax in verse four and the great outburst of joy and assurance in verse six. The omitted verse reads:

Still the small inward voice I hear,
That whispers all my sins forgiven;
Still the atoning blood is near,
That quench'd the wrath of hostile Heaven:
I feel the life His wounds impart;
I feel my Saviour in my heart.

The three main characteristics of Charles Wesley as a poet are his stress on Arminianism, his constant use of quotations from the Bible or poets, and his employment of words expressing space when describing God. 'And can it be' clearly illustrates all of them. It is entitled 'Free Grace', and it describes a grace applying to all men even including its writer. Lest his miserable Calvinist opponents should doubt, he drives home his main points with his usual vigour: the grace and mercy are immense and free and infinite; they are not for the few but for all of Adam's helpless race.

Later in this paper one verse will be examined in detail to illustrate the copious use of quotation and Biblical reference, but the reader who even glances through the whole poem will immediately see that its writer's mind was saturated with the words of the Epistles and the Book of Revelation. As Charles Wesley thought on God and man, phrases from the scriptures, which he seems to have known by heart, came automatically to his tongue.

The third characteristic was loosely defined as the stress on the idea of space when describing God. This statement requires a little clarification. The writer is dealing with God's mercy, grace, and goodness, all of which cannot be measured, but as a

poet he must try to express them. The size is illimitable, infinite; it is beyond depth, height, width; it is a river overflowing; it is a fire unquenchable. These metaphors constantly occur in nearly all the verse of Charles Wesley. In this particular poem we find angels failing to sound the depths of mercy, grace which is free, immense and infinite, and mercy immense and free.

Given that background of Wesley's habitual thought and mode of expression, let us examine his working on the poem. A tremendous experience has just befallen him, upsetting and overturning his life, and yet at the same time flooding him with vitality and joy. The unbelievable, the inexplicable has happened. So great and so good is this experience that his own unworthiness stands out in vivid contrast. But how is all this to be expressed?

Many lesser writers have felt similar emotions and have tried to describe them, falling into the easy temptation of luxuriating in their own feelings. After all, what is so pleasant as a little self-examination, a little public self-abasement, when it is followed by a generous amount of more detailed imagination of one's own later personal glory? It is the temptation into which lesser hymn writers fall with sickening persistency. They write hymns about themselves, and throw in a few references to God. Charles Wesley seldom fails in that manner, and in this poem he is completely successful in avoiding the danger. It is a poem about God, God's mercy, God's grace, God's love, power, light, God's throne. In contrast to this is the picture of the small, insignificant writer who only becomes important when God sees him as such. Thus, we have a poem which is also a true hymn: its theme is God.

So the central theme is right when Wesley begins to examine the experience which has come to him. How is he to express its wonder, his own surprise, his almost abject amazement? Most of this is done by a most skilful use of stress and repetition. The first two verses are composed of questions and exclamations — questions too vast for earth and most of heaven to answer, followed immediately by exclamations of amazement that in practice the solution has been found.

The first verse is a masterpiece of quite subtle artistry. A lesser writer might well have posed the first question, 'And can it be?' and have answered it by the clear and true statement, 'He died for me.' But it is not cold fact which he wishes to express: it is amazement.

Died He for me, who caused His pain?
For me who Him to death pursued?

The poem opens as if the questions come bursting in upon the writer in the midst of other thoughts upon religion. The surprise is personal. Three times in one verse he repeats 'for me', and yet the theme is still about God's astonishing mercy. The effect is achieved by varying the place of the phrase in each line, putting it first in the middle, then at the beginning, and finally at the end of a line. We may well contrast the crude use of repetition made by some nineteenth-century hymn writers who weary us with the same expression time after time at the beginning of lines. There is also a threefold reference to the death of Christ. We can also note how the questioning 'And can it be?' becomes the amazed 'How can it be!' Thus, as in a piece of music, various short phrases are repeated at intervals, gaining something by their new surroundings or acquiring fresh emphasis. 'The breathless questioning surprise that the death of Christ could possibly affect him, which has opened the verse, has been transmuted into the rapturous amazement that God himself has died for him.

The second and third verses develop the themes already established about the unfathomable mystery of saving grace. There is a vivid picture of the 'first-born seraph' trying to comprehend the divine love but finding it too profound even for angels. True to the Wesley habit, however, Charles proceeds to show what has happened in

creation, and propounds in verse the theology of a grace so wide that it embraces all mankind and so particular that it has sought out the writer himself. The depth of this theological setting is followed by the climax of the poem, which is surely one of the most dramatic verses in all religious poetry.

The problem that the poet has to solve is not only that of exact description of the change which has occurred in his life, but also how to paint his contrasts vividly enough. What are earth's greatest contrasts? Darkness — light, life — death, slavery — freedom. He seizes on all of them as Biblical reminiscences surge into his mind. Firstly there is the story of the rescue of Peter from prison by the angel: but there are also traces of Paul seeing the blazing light on the Damascus road. Is it even far fetched to catch a hint of the story of Lazarus being ordered 'forth' from the tomb? There is, close following, a reference to clothing. Thus, verse four pictures a slave bound and chained cast into a deep dungeon for many years. The preparation for the contrast is made.

Suddenly comes the light. We can now watch a most skilled technician at work with words. Like many great poets when they have reached the climax of emotion or passion, Wesley relies on the power of monosyllables. Twenty of the next twenty-two words have one syllable only. The twenty-two words make seven phrases, abrupt, sudden, staccato.

We can here note that the verse falls naturally into two parts. The first three lines consist of slow moving phrases, full of long vowels and words of many syllables. It is eighteenth-century diction at its most effective pitch. In fact the third line is borrowed almost whole from Pope, who in *Eloisa to Abelard* had written:

Thine eye diffused a reconciling ray,
And gleams of glory brightened all the day.

We should notice too the effective use made of alliteration as he repeats the sounds of n, l, and s.

Long my imprisoned spirit lay
Fast bound in sin and nature's night;
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray —

But when we look at the second half of the verse, we find language that Mr. Pope and Mr. Prior would have thought too plain and ordinary for a great occasion. The poetic diction of the eighteenth century has become the Romantic's language, the speech of common men, as Wordsworth was later to describe it. The break in the verse shows not only what was happening in English religious life, but also the fresh emphasis in literature. In the past the eye had diffused a quickening ray, but in future the chains would fall off and the heart be free. The alliteration in this half is chiefly on the letter f.

I woke, the dungeon flamed with light;
My chains fell off, my heart was free,
I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.

I have sometimes amused myself by rewriting this verse as a lesser man might have done it.

My spirit long in darkness lay;
'Twas bound in sin and nature's night.
Thine eye diffused a quickening ray —
I woke and saw a dazzling light.
My hands and feet were quickly free,
And so I came to follow Thee.

This is, of course, making rubbish of the verse; yet it can serve to emphasize exactly what Wesley has been able to do. The important words 'long' and 'fast' have been brought to the beginning of the lines. The effect of the short dramatic phrases become obvious. Then a more subtle effect emerges. He is drawing a picture of a slave chained in a black dungeon, when suddenly he is set free. His chains come off, and so we must assume that his hands and feet are free — but Wesley is not really dealing with the physical chains of an actual slave, but using the incident as a metaphor for a much greater happening. He has used it plainly to great effect, but he knows when to transmute it:

My chains fell off, MY HEART was free.

A lesser man would have dragged the metaphor accurately on, until it was worn to shreds like that in 'Will your anchor hold'. Wesley knew that it was not mere hands which were freed, it was the very heart itself.

So the writer reaches his dramatic crisis and for his effect employs short words and staccato phrases. How is he effectively to complete his poem? It is no time for finicky words or scrappy sentences: it is the time for pulling out all the stops and using the full organ. He turns to Paul at the climax of his Epistles, and to the rapture of the writer of the Book of Revelation. The vowels are broad and open, the words long, heavy and full — condemnation, dread, divine, clothed, righteousness, approach, throne, eternal. The verse is full of variants on the long vowels 'a' and 'o', and there is a subtle use of the consonant sounds 'k' and 'l'.

No condemnation now I dread;
Jesus, and all in Him, is mine!
Alive in Him, my living Head,
And clothed in righteousness divine,
Bold I approach the eternal throne,
And claim the crown, through Christ, my own.

The whole skill of the thing can be seen when the last two verses are read aloud or sung with understanding. Can any real singer fail with the music of the last verse or forget to do his utmost with the thunder of the last line? It is true lyric verse: it is written to be sung.

But we must also notice the end of our metaphor of contrast. The slave was chained, long imprisoned, confined in a dark dungeon. Now he is to be set free and brought into the light once more. Wesley does this. But the true note of the early Methodist experience was not mere joy and freedom: it was a measure overflowing, not pleasure, but rapture and ecstasy. So the dungeon FLAMES with light; the slave is not only released but also freed from all future blame or penalty. More than this, he is clothed like a prince — the prodigal is home — and taken into the dazzling light of the king's court. To the very throne itself he goes. Only one other glory is possible — he claims as a right, his crown. The slave is a prince. That is Charles Wesley making use of contrast.

This was the intoxicating poetry that the Wesleys gave men to sing. It was verse full of contrasts, with the quiet depths of introspection and the thunderous raptures of the full orchestra; it was firmly rooted in the best soil of its own age and yet growing toward an even brighter future; it was practical Christianity but it was passionate. It expressed the Methodist theology in lyrical songs about God. The first-born seraph could not quite understand what was happening, but the early Methodists grasped the essentials of grace and mercy with their depth, and passion, and truth, as they joined in a common fellowship to sing their national anthem.

T. B. SHEPHERD

CAMBRIDGE FORTY YEARS AGO

Some Memories and Impressions

It would be a pity if the writing of memoirs and recollections were to be confined to the great and famous. For one thing, that would tend to widen the gulf between two social worlds; and for another, the historian of the future might be deprived of some useful and necessary material. Besides, did not old Montaigne say that on the subject of himself he was the most learned man alive? So, without further excuse, I venture to write down a few random memories and impressions of Cambridge as it appeared to a raw undergraduate just forty years ago. The death of Queen Victoria only four years earlier marked the close of an epoch, but the great Victorian compromise in life and literature still held; it was a fairly solid, confident age. As a recent historian reminds us, for a penny, one could travel a mile by train, buy a morning and an evening newspaper, or send a letter to Australia.

First impressions of Cambridge were disappointing; such a flat, dreary town it seemed, after Bristol and Clifton. A young dream-haunted idealist perhaps was vaguely expecting to find the Colleges set like gems, each with acres and acres of glorious sheltering grounds. Anyhow, those Colleges were there; that was the main thing, and nothing could destroy the fabled glamour of those haunts of ancient peace and learning. Trinity, to which I had been granted admission, was certainly imposing enough, a very great College, almost a University in itself. Impossible for me even to name her illustrious sons, many of whose portraits looked down upon us each evening in the great dining-hall.

Montagu Butler, the famous Master who dominated the College in my time, was a truly great man, in body, mind, and character. But who could do justice to that patriarchal figure, surely the last of the Victorians? ('We do it wrong being so majestic!') I hear once again that silver-tongued eloquence as he thanked J. J. Thomson (who later on succeeded him in the Mastership) for his popular lecture in the College Hall. The subject was 'The Atom and its Structure'; and I suppose it was, in its way, a definite landmark in the history of Science, for it was a sort of pre-view of the wonderful new discoveries in Electro-physics about to be announced to the world. Again I see the stately figure, in full scarlet, bidding farewell to King Alphonso XIII and his Queen at the great Gate after their brief visit; and I noticed that the courtly Spanish grace was not confined to one side! Most vivid of all is my last memory of the Master; it was Mrs. Butler's 'At Home' in Trinity Lodge, the evening of the conferment of honorary degrees. The guests included Lord Rayleigh, H. H. Asquith, Rudyard Kipling, and other celebrities; but I still see Montagu Butler as a gracious radiant figure. There was in him that rare blend of greatness and simplicity, so that, looking back over the years, one feels that something unique has gone out of the world.

My 'tutor' (a merely *in loco parentis* relationship) was St. John Parry, who later became Dean and then Vice-Master, the Junior Dean being E. W. Barnes, the present Bishop of Birmingham. My chief guide in the Moral Sciences Tripos was MacTaggart, the famous philosopher, a rather odd, lovable figure who poured out an amazing variety of Hegelian stuff to a scanty band of men and women students. James Ward was about to retire and A. N. Whitehead who was then lecturing on Mathematics was hardly known to the philosophical world. MacTaggart was probably at his brilliant best in those social evenings, with the whisky at hand, and a few aspiring young spirits enjoying his sallies against orthodoxy in general and country parsons in particular. J. M. Keynes and others I remember in that connexion; he was then a young graduate of King's, and was already known as a brilliant economist. I am now convinced that it is a pity that many young and immature students should plunge too early into the dangerous currents of abstract philosophy. If, as the wisest

of the Greeks maintained, true philosophy is really born of wonder and worship, mere logic-chopping and dialectical exercises are no substitute. In the light of the deeper experiences of life one can understand why Cambridge philosophy at that time was a rather dismal affair as James Ward himself once confessed. Our Moral Science Club however did take itself very seriously. For instance, I remember a long paper on 'The Nature of Truth' by Bertrand Russell, who was revisiting his old College. W. R. Sorley, our lecturer in Ethics, was a great help, a man whose character well matched his learning. It was at his home that I met his son, Charles Hamilton Sorley, then a silent schoolboy, who fell in the battle of Loos in 1915, leaving the memory of one who would have taken a high place amongst our true poets.

Having gone up to Cambridge as an ex-pupil teacher, intending to take up teaching as a life-work, I was also a member of the University Day Training College and thus came into close contact with the celebrated Oscar Browning, 'the O.B.' as we always called him. He was already a character and a legend; that short corpulent figure with the massive bald head and the lazy rolling gait was one of the sights of Cambridge. He had only two portraits in his dining-room, Napoleon and himself! After the old unhappy days as an assistant master at Eton, in the sixties, it was a great consolation to him to become the founder and first Principal of the Day Training College. His earlier ambition had been to train statesmen (amongst his pupils had been G. N. Curzon and Austen Chamberlain) and then later on, to help elementary schoolmasters to combine their professional training with an Honours course at Oxford or Cambridge. In spite of his oddities and absurd egotism, 'the O.B.' was a true guide, philosopher, and friend to many a struggling youth. The pathos of those last years in Rome, so different from his former princely ways of living, was suggested by a friendly letter he sent me not long before his death at 86. In it he wrote: 'I was never so happy in my life, and never better in health . . . I work very hard, writing a History of the World in eight large volumes.'

In spite of the natural tension between Philosophy and Religion, heightened as it was by the University atmosphere, I kept up the habit of attendance at public worship, though with shaken faith. Old 'Hobson Street', with its gloomy underground Sunday School, was our Methodist centre. William Bradfield and F. H. Benson, both big men, with a great message, attracted a fair number of Dons and undergraduates, and Dr. Barber of the Leys held a weekly society class in term time. There was also the opportunity of hearing other preachers, notably G. A. Johnston Ross who was the most eloquent preacher I have ever listened to. Conspicuous in his congregation were Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson; it was a great experience to be invited to their home to see their famous MSS. and other treasures from the Near East. That reminds me that on one or two occasions I happened to catch sight of J. G. Frazer (of *Golden Bough* fame) as he passed through the court on his brief visits; and also there was A. C. Haddon, the anthropologist whose home was crowded with curios from Far Eastern seas. Many years later, whilst on a health voyage from China to Australia, I happened to meet a man who had been with Haddon on one of his expeditions amongst the cannibals of the Fly River in New Guinea. W. H. R. Rivers, also prominent in that circle, was our teacher in Experimental Psychology. He fitted up a laboratory out of two cottages in Mill Lane, and that I believe was the first of its kind in this country. What a vast development there has been in that branch of science since James Ward, only a few years earlier, became the virtual founder of British Psychology! . . . But, to return to the religious activities, in addition to C.I.C.C.U. and our own Wesley Society, there was the Nonconformist Union where, on any Sunday evening, one might listen to T. R. Glover (then a young Don just feeling his way to that great work of his amongst students of many lands), or H. G. Wood, whose extremely modest unassuming manner masked a powerful mind. Special

visitors too, we had now and then: e.g. F. C. Burkitt and H. M. Gwatkin. To listen to the latter was a rather painful experience owing to his physical infirmities, but a great privilege.

Finally, I note a few random experiences, high-lights that somehow never fade: for instance, A. W. Verrall, declaiming great passages of Euripides from his invalid chair; A. J. Balfour strolling along the Backs in earnest conversation with his sister, Mrs. Henry Sidgwick, who was then Principal of Newnham — perhaps they were discussing problems raised by the rapid growth of the College, or was it Mrs. Sidgwick's presidential address to the Society for Psychical Research? Then there was R. B. Haldane, from the War Office, appealing in a Senate House meeting for his new Territorial army. 'This magnificent material', he exclaimed, surveying the great audience of undergraduates. Alas! we could not imagine the havoc of the years to come. Nor could anyone have foretold that on the evening of Armistice Day, 11th November 1918, he, the man who, more than any other, had striven to prepare the nation for that first great struggle with Germany, would be sitting in his lonely bachelor-flat, neglected and forgotten. Another public meeting that I shall always remember was on social reform; the chairman was Alfred Marshall, then an old man. His few quiet comments were strangely impressive, but in my ignorance of the whole subject of Economics I could not know how great his work was to prove. Many authorities have since maintained that he and John Ruskin together changed the whole basis and character of that subject, 'humanized' it, perhaps one ought to say. Another meeting in King's, to which I was invited by a friend (the Fabian Society probably), was addressed by Bernard Shaw, who poured out a steady stream of facts and opinions and common sense. The chairman told us that the Provost, feeling doubtful about granting permission for the meeting to be held on the College premises, had asked about the speaker's 'ethical basis'; so a discreet inquiry was sent. G.B.S. had replied, on a post card: 'Tell the old boy my *e.b.* is the same as his own!'

To those who came later, all this may represent 'an outworn buried age', hardly more than a catalogue of names perhaps, but for me those were the days, and I am sure there were giants in those days. Cambridge had precious things to offer, many of which have left sacred and undying memories. Whatever happens, some of these memories and impressions will always remain

'photographically lined on the tablets of my mind
when a yesterday has faded from its page'.

CHARLES GIMBLETT

SOME RECENT CHILDREN'S BOOKS AND BOOKS FOR YOUTH WORKERS

What goes with what (Collins, 7s. 6d.), in colour photography, is a book and a game that will both delight the three- to six-year-olds and teach them language, observation, and expression. Children two or three years older will be glad to have the broadcast of the Brydon children in permanent form as *St. Jonathans in the Country*, by Kathleen Fidler (Lutterworth Press, 6s.). From the same publishers come two adventure yarns, each at 5s., and each guaranteed to thrill the nine to twelves — *Fortune's Coin*, by Carol Forrest, and *Rebel Wings*, by Erroll Collins; the latter will appeal especially to girls. This age group will find in *Gadget City*, by I. O. Evans (F. Warne, 3s. 6d.), an exciting story of an ancient Briton sold as a slave and shipped to Alexandria. Humour mingles with adventure as he is introduced to the many inventions and new religion of the old City.

There are few new books for adolescents that one would commend, but of books

for youth workers there is a steady stream, and amongst them four from the Epworth Press call for attention. In a series of short sketches of missionary pioneers *The Glorious Company*, by Winifred Mathews (2s.) tells of the spread of Christianity and its triumphs in the East. The choice is catholic, for it includes Peter Xavier, Carey, J. R. Mott, and Kagawa. Both this book and *My Faith and My Job* (3s.) will help leaders looking for material for talks and discussion. The latter consists of ten broadcast talks which relate the faith to ordinary life, and show its relevance and value in varied occupations. *Evangelism in the Youth Club*, by Bryan H. Reed (1s.), is a mine of wise counsel and helpful suggestion in the difficult task of putting across religion to youngsters who are ignorant and shy of it. Direct and indirect methods of approach are outlined. The pamphlet is eminently practical, and its author has clearly working knowledge of all he says. It is not quite the same with *Youth and the Peace*, by Edwin Tempest (5s.). Yet, while many may think some of its suggestions impracticable, it shows an urgent sense of the opportunities and need for adventurous Christian Youth Work, and contains a good chapter on youth agencies in Germany and U.S.S.R.

- *Sex Education in the Club*, by Leslie Keating (Religious Education Press, Wallington, Surrey, 1s. 6d.), is planned 'to help the leader in the open or unattached Youth Club or Youth Centre who must tackle the subject of Sex Education'. While the last and all too short chapter entitled 'The Christian attitude to sex', by Dr. Evelyn Frost, is an admirable essay, Christian principles on this all-important question are not an extra to be tacked on to other teaching but something which must permeate the whole. Mr. Keating has much to say from his own experience in the Sawston Village College which will help the Club Leader, but the entirely satisfactory book on this subject has yet to be written. Perhaps we are still in the exploratory stage and Mr. Keating will himself later produce the book for which many are waiting. *Programme Possibilities for Church Youth Groups* (S.C.M., 1s.) should be in the hands of every minister and youth worker. It is full of practical schemes for introducing into club programmes worship, Bible study, Christian doctrine and the like, and it has a useful bibliography. It is sponsored by the Youth Department of the British Council of Churches. Another helpful pamphlet is *The Approach to Religion in the Club* (N.A.G.C. & M.C., 1s.), which contains six valuable studies on questions often raised by club members, such as 'Does God Exist?' and 'Why go to Church?' Three publications from the Methodist Youth Department deserve mention. *A Rural Youth Service*, by D. Edwards-Rees (3s. 6d.), needs little more than the name of the author to commend it, for she is an acknowledged expert in this field. In her latest book Miss Rees does for the country what she had previously done for the towns by her *Service of Youth Book*, giving wise guidance for establishing and running youth clubs in the villages. The problems which will have to be faced by the raising of the school-leaving age are discussed with sympathetic understanding. *Round the Club Room Fire*, edited by E. H. Hayes and R. G. Martin (3s. 6d.), is intended to help leaders in clubs whose members have no religious loyalties. It starts 'where the young people are', and such topics as Work and Leisure, the Colour Bar and Imperialism, Betting and Bad Language, the Church and Prayer, are dealt with in a sane and interesting fashion. Teachers in the Young People's Department of the Sunday School will be grateful for this sound book. The *Youth Department Handbook* is a well-indexed, loose-leaf reference book with sections for every phase of children's and youth activities — Sunday School, Wesley Guild, C.E., Club, uniformed organizations, etc. It is procurable only from the Department; the price (5s. 6d.) covers leaflets to be issued in the next year.

Finally, a book for all ages — *Daughters of the Islands*, by Evelyn A. Downs (Religious Education Press, Wallington, Surrey, 7s. 6d.) — is beautifully produced, with two coloured plates and 48 charming photo-reproductions. In simple but graphic style,

without pretending to be a complete and sustained study, it tells of the L.M.S. girls boarding school at Papauta, Samoa, which was a pioneer effort at its commencement in 1892. Despite difficulties rising from the conservatism and indolence of the Polynesian this experiment in Christian education is now firmly established and abundantly justified. The girls share a communal life which besides formal teaching includes cookery, house-work, husbandry, nursery work and local crafts. The combination of sound educational method with concern for indigenous culture was practised from the start with a foresight rare in the nineties.

J. K. WHITEHEAD

THE MENTAL HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN: HIS WORK AND EQUIPMENT

THE Church as a whole appears ignorant of the vast field of work waiting to be done in our Mental Hospitals amongst patients suffering from neurosis and psychosis. Too often it is taken for granted that so long as a chaplain is appointed to visit once or twice a week, and conduct services on a Sunday, this is all that is necessary or possible. The idea of the visit is that the chaplain 'shall attend to the spiritual welfare of the patients', but such a conception is wholly lacking in insight into the real nature of the work waiting to be done.

In most cases a straightforward spiritual approach is worse than useless, for it merely excites resentment and aggression. Patients on admission are in a high state of nervous tension, and generally suspicious of everybody. Before all else the confidence of the patient has to be won. Simple lessons need to be given on how to gain physical and mental relaxation, and these should be followed by graded imaginative exercises which build up in the patient a new 'feeling tone' and outlook upon life, and so give him the ability to accept life's inevitable contradictions and conflicts. Here all logical arguments, however tempting, must be left aside, for we are dealing in the main with that which is essentially illogical and irrational. It is precisely because the patient does not understand himself and his own conflicting emotional attitudes to life, and feels that nobody else understands him either, that he has broken down. It is therefore his 'feeling tone' which has to be changed, and this will only be accomplished by helping him to realize that the secret of his healing lies within the neurosis itself. He must be led to see that that in his outlook which appears to be working for his destruction and overwhelms him with darkness and fear, has in reality a purposive and life-giving end. Instead of resisting and fighting he must learn to understand and make friends with this 'other self', since this is an essential means towards the integration of his whole personality. In other words his illness is to be treated, not merely causally, but teleologically.

Once a patient has really grasped this idea, it is amazing how his whole attitude to life is changed, and the feeling established that by the help of the chaplain and doctors the solution to his problem will be found. Only after this preliminary work has been done, can direct spiritual teaching be given, and the patient helped to see that nearly all neuroses and psychoses are at bottom concerned with a fundamental metaphysical problem. This can only be solved by religious faith, whereby he is able to accept his limitations and his position in the universe as a creature, and acknowledge his dependence upon the Creator.

The work in a mental hospital is extremely strenuous. As things are, only one full-time chaplain is appointed even to a hospital of some two thousand patients, and much has perforce to be neglected. It is indeed a crime and tragedy that the urgent need and value of this work is at present so little recognized by the 'powers that be',

both in the Church and State, but even under present circumstances much can be done. If a chaplain can gain the sympathy and understanding of the medical superintendent, he can do much valuable and interesting work by forming small groups of from twelve to twenty patients, and giving them simple lectures, illustrated with chalk diagrams, on the relationship of body, mind, endocrine element, and environment, together with talks and diagrammatic explanations of the development of the *psyche*. Such talks and discussions are invaluable for making contacts with shy patients, who 'open up' under these circumstances much more freely, and they are also useful for forming a background for later individual treatment.

Another interesting and valuable piece of work may be tackled in co-operation with anyone of the medical staff who can be persuaded to co-operate, by forming small groups of Paranoid and aggressive Delusional types, and letting them choose their own subjects for debate. For this purpose it is essential that both the doctor and chaplain should drop their official titles, and become two members of the group. Subjects are chosen a week before, and each member comes prepared to speak for five minutes, and then a general discussion follows. The patients elect one of their own number as chairman and any subject may be discussed — even the Lunacy Act, if asked for, or proposals for improving the running and management of mental hospitals — but lighter subjects should be tactfully inserted in the programme, such as sport, literature, and plays. Even patients of the most aggressive type, when treated in this natural and normal way and allowed to get grievances 'off their chests' without fear of being penalized, become in a very short time far less aggressive and even friendly.

In addition much interesting material comes to light, and some of the suggestions made can be brought to the notice of the medical superintendent or visiting committee and carried into effect. It is not suggested, of course, that one can always effect a cure by these methods, but they go a very long way toward making life more peaceable and endurable for such patients, and this is something well worth achieving.

It follows from the above that men for this essential work should be adequately trained in general psychology and therapy and in elementary psychological medicine. They should have real aptitude for the work, coupled with great charity and patience. This is true even though in the long run it is always the personality of the worker which counts, and the chaplain above all others must never allow himself to become tied to any one particular school of psychology. For those who are thinking of taking up this work the following books will be found useful for a beginning:

Clinical Lectures on Psychological Medicine, by Henry Yellowlees (J. & A. Churchill, 14s.).

Psycho-Analysis and its Derivatives, by H. Crichton-Miller (Home University Library, 3s.).

The Psychology of Jung, by Johan Jacobi (12s. 6d.).

Modern Man in search of a Soul, by C. T. Young (12s. 6d.).

The Psychology of Character, by Rudolf Allers (Sheed & Ward, 3s. 6d.).

DERRICK BURKE

Chaplain, Napsbury Mental Hospital

Editorial Comments

A GREAT AMERICAN TRADITION

It is strange that three peace-loving men should go down to history as war-leaders. No one could think of Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, or Franklin D. Roosevelt as war-lords, yet each was forced by circumstance to play his part in a tragic war. Abraham Lincoln, slain by a madman's bullet, has grown in stature with the passing years. A fine phrase of Edwin Markham's describes him as 'the captain with the thinking heart' and the quality of his leadership is revealed most clearly in his great war-time speeches. He 'belongs to the ages' and his challenge to man's humanity has immortalized him.

In the two World Wars America has not failed to provide two leaders in the great tradition. Both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt themselves became casualties of the wars they helped to win. There were qualities in each of them which show their likeness of Lincoln. The passionate guardianship of the rights of the people, the deep sense of moral and spiritual values, the generosity which could forgive with grace — even the capacity to relieve tension by the telling of a whimsical tale — all these things seem to be part of a continuing tradition. 'When you come into the presence of a leader of men,' said Wilson, when speaking of Robert E. Lee, 'you know you have come into the presence of fire — that it is best not incautiously to touch that man — that there is something which makes it dangerous to cross him, that if you grapple his mind you will find that you have grappled with flame and fire. You do not want sweetness merely and light in men who lead you.' Perhaps that particular speech indicates something of this American conception of leadership. 'There was just as much fire in Lee as there was in Washington, but he was always well in hand. You knew that the man himself was aware that he was driving a mettlesome team, which he had to watch at every moment to avoid sudden runaway.' When he became President he made it clear that he felt it his duty to lead. 'The people will forgive a President his mistakes,' he said, 'but they will not forgive him if he declines to lead.' Like Lincoln in an earlier day, and Roosevelt later, Woodrow Wilson began his fight against snobbery at Princeton long before he became the great national leader. At his inauguration he made plain that his first concern was the 'ordinary man' and he did it by a simple gesture. As a vast throng waited beyond the barriers he cried out, 'Remove the ropes and let the people in'. It was the kind of thing Lincoln or Roosevelt would have said. It was surely part of the great tradition.

Nor must one forget in assessing the value of American leadership today, the factor of religious conviction. Again one may see in Wilson a characteristic common to Lincoln and Roosevelt. When he was Governor of New Jersey, and at a critical stage in his political career, he ended a speech at the Capitol Club in Raleigh with the simple statement, 'I do not understand how any man can approach the discharge of responsible duties without faith in the Lord Jesus Christ'. His triumph in the Presidential election did not lessen his candour nor lower his conception of his tremendous task. 'This is not a day of triumph,' he said at his inauguration, it is a day of dedication. Here muster not the forces of party but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts must wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares to try it? I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them if they will but counsel and sustain me.'

We should expect such leadership combining strength and humility, to postulate generosity of heart. When William J. Bryan was Wilson's most dangerous competitor for the Presidential office, political opponents strove to exaggerate their differences

of opinion, and by a strategic revelation to divide the Democratic camp. In a speech that night Woodrow Wilson said: 'One of the most striking things in recent years is that with all the rise and fall of particular ideas, with all the ebb and flow of particular proposals, there has been one interesting fixed point in the history of the Democratic Party and that fixed point has been the character and the preaching of William Jennings Bryan. . . . He has had the steadfast vision all along . . . and he has not based his career upon calculation, but has based it upon principle.' The audience, which had expected either a stubborn defence or recrimination thrilled at this generous tribute. The speaker ended with what was described as a real Chesterfieldian gesture: 'Let us apologize to each other that we ever suspected or antagonized one another; let us join hands once more all around the circle of community of council and of interest, which will show us at the last to have been indeed the friends of our country and the friends of mankind.' . . . The last sentence was drowned by the cheers of those who listened.

In spite of these examples it may be urged that there is a vast difference between the British and American tradition. If it be a question of idiom or of restraint, one would be compelled to agree, but in the critical days in which we live it is more important to discover similarities than to exaggerate differences.

Never before was so great a responsibility laid upon two allied peoples as that which now rests upon the people of the United States and the British Commonwealth. In this hour, big with problems but shining with possibilities, one might well rejoice that there is so nearly a common tradition in our ideas of leadership. Beyond political party lies the cause of humanity, and the new world must be shaped not only by unselfishness in leading but in following too.

In Britain we have known too little of American political life and conduct of affairs. The complexities of transatlantic politics have either baffled us or bored us. It is time that we began to interest ourselves more closely. Amongst the authoritative writers who can help us is Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the U.S. Navy 1913-21, and in his own way an American Pepys.¹ In the homeliest, freest manner, he has set out the story of a great era in the history of the Democratic Party in the United States. Hailing from North Carolina, he dubs himself, the 'Tar Heel Editor' and writes of great events and the intimate details of political strife with disarming honesty and unrivalled knowledge. His memoirs do not claim to be elaborately arranged historical criticism; they are lively chronicles from which one may gather exactly the kind of information which would help the average Britisher to understand and appreciate his American cousin in a day when our common task will be the better fulfilled if we feel respect and indeed affection for one another, in this restless and war-weary world.

'I fancy it is just as hard to do your duty when men are sneering at you,' said President Wilson, 'as when they are shooting at you. When they shoot at you, they can take your national life; when they sneer at you, they can wound your living heart.' The revealing memoirs of Josephus Daniels may turn the sneers of ignorance into smiles of understanding, and the handclasp of glad co-operation.

PROTESTANT GERMANS

There is a general impression that the Christians in Germany failed to register any definite protest against Nazi regime which was responsible for so much brutal treatment of subjected peoples. Evidence of its deliberate policy of cruelty has accumulated since the war ended. Such evidence is not only drawn from the sensational revelations in the more notorious concentration camps, but also from the gradual discovery of the results of the application of Nazi philosophy to life in general. It has

¹ *The Wilson Era*, Josephus Daniels (University of North Carolina Press, Humphrey Milford, 242. net).

been suggested on the one hand that the German public, as a whole, was ignorant of these details and, on the other hand, that some members of the Christian communities in Germany did make protests and suffered the consequence of their temerity by being imprisoned or killed. No doubt there is a measure of truth in such comments, but the Allied peoples have looked, either indignantly or wistfully, for some signs of penitence from the German people themselves now that the facts have been made apparent to all. Whilst there may be no marked attitude of contrition on the part of the great majority it would be unjust to say that there is a complete absence of any appreciation of the enormities. One of the more recent pronouncements comes from Dr. F. Siegmund-Schultze, a distinguished scholar and Christian leader. In a letter written from Protestant Germans in Switzerland he expresses, on their behalf, their sense of deep contrition before God and man. The fact that many people in Germany had at least some idea of what was happening and yet remained silent is sorrowfully confessed, and the Church, as a whole, is condemned as having spoken 'too late' and 'too timidly'. The whole document, published by 'The International Fellowship of Reconciliation', is worth careful consideration by those who are working to re-establish Christianity in Europe. 'The German people has yielded to the spirit of violence to such a degree', says Dr. Schultze, 'that incalculable harm has been caused to its own and other nations. Justice has been brought low, human dignity trampled underfoot, brutality exalted to a system. The crime of the wholesale extermination of persons of another race, or of those regarded as politically undesirable, cries aloud to heaven and has brought down the wrath of God upon Germany.' After this blunt statement he reaffirms the belief of German Protestants in their future. 'The extent of the collapse corresponds to the extent of the presumption. . . . We look up to Christ who upon the Cross bore the guilt of all men and awaits our repentance. Repentance must mean the renunciation of all ways of violence and all aims at power politics.' Here is the starting point for new and high endeavour. In this spirit we might look for a new, sane, and Christian Germany. At any rate one must reckon with small groups of sincere Christians working for the re-creation, re-education and re-consecration of the people at large. It may be said that this document represents only a small section of German Protestantism, and indeed, a section at present in Switzerland. Even so it is indicative of tremendous possibilities, and every effort must be made to discover such communities and to co-ordinate their expression of penitence and of faith. No Christian people could resist the implied appeal of Dr. Schultze's closing sentence: 'The renewal of the German people in the spirit of Christ should not be the concern of German Protestants only but the prayer of the whole of Christendom.' To react to this in a spirit of cynicism or to remain passive lest one should be accused of 'softness' would be to betray one's trust to Christianity and to Christ Himself.

THE NATIONAL TRUST

Fifty years ago three people — Miss Octavia Hill, Sir Robert Hunter, and Canon Rawnsley — founded the National Trust. As a result of their action it has been possible to save part of our national heritage which was then threatened by what was called 'important' and 'economic development'.

The aftermath of the Industrial Revolution was characterized by a strange eagerness to promote 'prosperity' at all costs! Common lands were seized for building sites, and ancient buildings were pulled down or adapted without scruple. The policy was defended on the ground that economic values were increased and the public were benefited. To have protested that this was achieved by the sacrifice of national beauty or historic interest would have caused considerable astonishment. Such things had no practical value in the eyes of many well-meaning people. The Romantic

Movement did much to restore the lost sense of beauty and to make it plain that it was a very real part of our national wealth.

In 1865, at the instigation of men like John Ruskin, William Morris, and T. H. Huxley, the Commons Preservation Society was established and it was followed in 1877 by the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings. These two movements helped to preserve a common-land, and to prevent the wholesale 'restoration' and 'adaptation' of historic buildings. Amongst those who fought hard to protect the natural beauty of our land were Octavia Hill, famous for her work in the housing of city-workers, Sir Robert Hunter, the solicitor to the Commons Preservation Society, and Canon Rawnsley, who successfully opposed the construction of a railway from Buttermere to Braithwaite. These three people realized that much more could be done to prevent vandalism and preserve the beauty of our countryside if a permanent Trust could undertake the responsibility for safeguarding land and buildings for the nation. The Romantic Movement had awakened the people to the wonder and beauty of nature and the National Trust has already accomplished a great deal to ensure that the countryside shall be kept safe from unsightly development. After fifty years it holds 110,000 acres of land and assumes responsibility for its upkeep. Natural beauty is preserved by expert management. In the case of a further 40,000 acres the Trust, though not owning the land, holds the right, by covenant, to condition all future development within certain specified limits.

In a book edited by James Lees-Milne,¹ Dr. G. M. Trevelyan makes a strong appeal as Chairman of the Estates Committee of the National Trust for increased support of an undertaking that is of importance. The growing desire on the part of city dwellers to spend their leisure in the country is significant of the recovery of the lost sense of the beauty to be found in Nature. Improved transport and the increase of Youth Hostels has encouraged this weekly trek to the unspoilt countryside. The Trust, whilst seeking to ensure the preservation of selected areas 'wishes to avoid turning its properties into "beauty spots" or "museum pieces"'. Its object is that natural beauty should remain "natural", and that agriculture should continue to flourish as agriculture.' Youth, in particular, must be educated in the necessity for considerate behaviour, even in the freedom of leisure-hours.

The increased burden of taxation has compelled many owners to sell ancient country houses or break up large estates. There is again the possibility of development, forced by the urgent necessity for housing, becoming uncontrolled. It is, of course, possible to provide suitable housing without spoiling the landscape. The Council for the Preservation of Rural England and the Scapa Society for the prevention of ugly advertisements are doing valuable work. The National Trust has, however, a specific task — 'the ownership and care of the properties committed to its charge'.

To the volume marking its jubilee, many experts have contributed essays on various aspects of the work of the Trust. The illustrations are excellent, but we have grown to expect that in a 'Batsford' book.

In a day when life is so often defined in the technical terms of the laboratory it is refreshing to read the words of the Master of Trinity as he stresses the need for the preservation of natural beauty and the provision of holiday grounds for the workers in industrial areas: 'It is also,' he says, 'a matter of preserving a main source of spiritual well-being and inspiration, on which our ancestors thrived and which we are in danger of losing for ever. . . . Unless we can refresh ourselves at least by intermittent contact with nature we grow awry. . . . Like the universe, like life, natural beauty is also a mystery. But whatever it may be, whether casual in its origin as some hold who love it well, or whether, as others hold, such splendour can be nothing less than the pur-

¹ *The National Trust*, edited by James Lees-Milne (Batsford, 12s. 6d.).

poseful message of God — whatever its interpretation may be, natural beauty is the ultimate spiritual appeal of the universe, of nature or of the God of nature, to their nursling man. . . .’ Though we might have preferred to take the matter a little farther, it is a starting-point from which the hiker may begin a salutary quest. It is still true that the first ‘wonder’ is the child of ignorance but the second is the parent of adoration. Because of this we believe that the National Trust has a fundamentally religious significance.

A NEW FACTOR IN HUMAN AFFAIRS

The situation created by the production of the atomic bomb has been described as ‘an awkward phase between two dispensations’. A great many extravagant things have been said and written in a sudden mood of apprehension. Armies and weapons of war are said to be obsolete already. Man’s quickened imagination sees already visions of indescribable horror and unbelievable delight. The sense of security expected when the actual warfare ceased has been largely destroyed by speculation as to the future use of the basic forces that may be released for good or ill, perhaps by irresponsible minorities. However restrained may be one’s judgement, it must be admitted that a new and terrible uncertainty lies behind the consideration of post-war problems. At such a time it is well to remember that which is not shaken, even by all the atomic energy of a universe. The effect of every important discovery depends upon the moral character of those to whom it is entrusted. The scientist, as scientist, claims the right to be neutral in matters of morality and that claim must be allowed. He cannot, however, remain merely a scientist; he is a member of society and as such has obligations. Neither the individual nor the State can disclaim all moral responsibility. There are those who in fear and trembling suggest that such secrets should never be revealed lest they be wrongly used. This surely is an impossible position, which would forbid all human progress. Prometheus might be put on trial and mankind condemned to a prehistoric cave, to lie in the cold lest he be burnt by his neighbour in the fire. The physical discoveries of our day are charged with blessing for mankind, if men will match their moral and spiritual life to their intellectual achievement. In a comment in the *Review of World Affairs* a significant warning is given. ‘The best of all would, of course, be for the human race so spiritually to revive that it became a moral impossibility for these newly harnessed forces to be used in war. Yet while human beings continue to ignore the only Source from which the restraining power can ever come that will prove impossible. It is odd that our generation, so signally the witness of physical phenomena, should yet so stubbornly refuse homage to the Maker. Scientific advance, plus world-wide agnosticism steadily reinforced by teaching children that authority and religious sanctities are so much rubbish, spells disaster.’ But disaster is avoidable on those unchanging conditions which man learnt in some measure in the wilderness of Sinai and heard interpreted in all their fullness by the shores of Galilee. If he but listen and obey, the forces of the universe are at once his friendly servitors.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Ministers in Council

NORTH WESTERN MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION. The Rev. H. Wakefield, the Association Secretary, kindly reports that the thirteenth session of the North Western Area Ministerial Association was held at the Elim Hall Drive Church, Liverpool, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, 12th, 13th, and 14th June.

The Chairman of the Liverpool District, the Rev. G. H. Taylor, M.A., B.D., preached the Association sermon on the Tuesday evening on Revelation xi. 15 (The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever). This was an inspiring introduction for the General Theme of the session, namely, The Kingdom of God. The service was followed by the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

On Wednesday morning, after opening devotions by the president of the Association, the Rev. A. L. Wigley, B.A., B.D., an essay was ready by the Rev. J. A. McGain on 'The Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus'. After preliminary words on the sources of Christ's conception of the Kingdom, the essayist dealt with the subjects of the kingdom and their duties. Paradoxes were inevitable in any survey of our Lord's teaching, dwelling as he does upon present possessions and future rewards, material and spiritual implications, and the reality of the reign in both the present and the future. Jesus showed himself to be a citizen of the world. His kingdom rests on free consent and is built on the love and service of its members. It is a true democracy, having as foundation the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The Rev. Ralph Noble of Chester opened the discussion with a searching critique. The ensuing conversation proved of keen interest.

In the afternoon the Rev. L. Duchars of Birkenhead contributed a paper on 'The relation of the Church's witness and service to the Kingdom'. As Jesus was the beginning of a new humanity, so was the Church of Christ a community created to be the instrument of the divine kingdom. This kingdom is misconceived if it be supposed to be a Utopia, whereas it is actually a spiritual force binding men into unity. Thus, the aim of the church must be to bring men to Christ, but it has a positive work in the making of a new society. The church is the shell within which the kingdom is growing. Whilst the kingdom is present on earth, yet it will never come completely here: it will not be seen in its consummation in time and space. A critique had been prepared by the Rev. James Axson of Golborne and was read in his absence. A fruitful talk showed the stimulus of the topic under consideration.

At the public meeting on Wednesday night the Rev. H. Wakefield spoke on 'The Kingdom of God and the Individual'. The Rev. W. R. Basham of Liverpool gave an address on 'The kingdom of God and the Community'. The congregation was ably led into the region of the central theme of the Gospels.

On the Thursday morning the Rev. B. E. Jones, M.A., B.D., of Liverpool, turned the thought of the Association to the Poetry of T. S. Eliot. Eliot was revealed as in revolt against earlier forms of poetry and also as set against mere simplicity and flabbiness or sentimentality. He was opposed to romanticism. A special section of the paper illustrated Eliot as poet, as modern, and as Christian. Then came instances of Eliot's prevailing themes, such as time, death, gloom. The discussion, led by the Rev. G. Harrison, was very animated.

* * * *

AN ENGLISH MORAL LEADERSHIP COURSE. We had the privilege recently of giving some account of a Moral Leadership Course held in Italy. Now we have had sent to us lecture notes of a Course held at Weston-super-Mare a few months ago.

It is a pleasure to read the summary of a lecture by Padre Cottrell on 'The Devotional Use of the Bible'. He urged that there should be an attitude of a prepared mind gained through the reading of such books as Allan Richardson's *Preface to Bible Study* (S.C.M.) or Basil Matthew's *Supreme Encounter* (S.C.M.), but especially an attitude of heart, summed up in 'I am listening, Lord, for Thee. What hast Thou to say to me?' The recommendation was given that a record should be made of texts and passages that have impressed and helped us, with a statement of the reason why they were such an inspiration. This will preserve them for future usefulness. When a word in a passage strikes a reader, he should compare it with its occurrence elsewhere and treasure its teaching. Thus the word 'run' in 1 Corinthians ix. 24 may be compared with its use in Galatians ii. 2, 5, 7 and Hebrews xii. 1, 2, and from these passages one may learn that the Christian life demands strict discipline and single-minded purpose, but that there is encouragement from the memory of those who have run their race and from the thought of the unfading wreath which Christ offers at the end of the race.

The same lecturer gave a very practical talk on 'The Means of Grace in the R.A.F.' and on 'What we are fighting for'. Another Padre outlined Lecture Exercises on the Book of Judges and on the First Epistle of John. An enticing subject, 'The Use of the Concordance and the R.V. Reference Bible' was introduced in another paper.

The Rev. C. H. Tribbeck, under the title 'The Gospel, the Nation, and the Empire', gave most helpful hints, with many concrete illustrations and titles of books and pamphlets for further reading. The question of the relation of the law of the land to the will of God was linked with Dr. Nathaniel Micklem's 'Sermon to Law Societies'. The problem of combining obedience to the State with alteration of the law was discussed with reference to *The Christian Basis of Democracy*, by Dr. Albert Peel (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.), Halevy's *History of England* (Penguin Series), and *The Fear of Freedom*, by Frich Fromm (Kegan Paul, 15s.). Concerning the United Nations, mention was made of *The Four Empires* (Time and Tide Publishing Co., 6d.) and *Thoughts on the New World*, by General Smuts (Times Publishing Co., 3d.). The British Empire was looked at as both a great family and as a sphere of Christian service. The bibliography appended included the following: *Argument of Empire*, by W. K. Hancock (Penguin), *Civitas Dei*, by Lionel Curtis (Oxford University Press, 25s.), and *The Life and Growth of the British Empire*, by J. A. Williamson (Cambridge University Press, 6d.). Two novels showing the menace of a bad or irresponsible imperialism as illustrated by Japan in the Pacific are *The Three Bamboos* and *Bonin* by Robert Standish (Peter Davies).

These lectures made a vivid impression and one wishes it were possible for them to be expanded into articles or booklets for wider consumption.

* * * * *

MINISTERS' REFRESHER COURSES AT LOUGHBOROUGH. From the Rev. R. J. Connell, B.A., B.D., we hear of an excellent Refresher Course for ministers of the Leicester and Northampton District held early in the year at the Loughborough College, from the Tuesday morning to the Thursday noon.

On the Tuesday morning a Communion Service was conducted by the Chairman of the District, the Rev. T. H. Johns, assisted by the Rev. G. Elliott, in the Leicester Road Church. Lunch was then taken at the College and in the afternoon Dr. Ryder Smith lectured on 'The Relation between the Old Testament and the New', and Dr. R. E. Roberts on 'The Present Position in Theology'. A bus then took to the Barrow Hostel those staying overnight, and after dinner Dr. S. G. Dimond lectured on 'The Study of Church History'. On the Wednesday and Thursday Dr. Ryder Smith and Dr. R. E. Roberts continued their lectures and Professor E. S. Waterhouse also spoke on 'The Present Position in Psychology' and on 'Psychology and Prayer'.

SIX YEARS' EVANGELISM IN ONE CHURCH. In these days when Evangelism is coming to its own in Anglican and Free Church programmes for action, it is refreshing to receive an account of what has actually been done during the six years of war time by sustained evangelism in one church.

A Light on a Hill is the title of an unpretentious, soberly written booklet by Mr. P. J. Haddy, of the Tilehurst Methodist Church, Reading (and to be had from that address for the sum of 2s. 6d.). Though produced in connexion with the Diamond Jubilee of that society, its main interest lies in the story of the amazing transformation in the lives of many and in the outlook of the church through the leadership of its minister and the whole-hearted following of his people in aggressive gospeling for the neighbourhood.

Though the whole tone of the book is quiet, the facts speak for themselves and amply justify the warm commendation of Dr. Sangster in the Foreword. At the forefront is placed a tribute to the Rev. W. Gowland by the church officers for his pioneering, converting, teaching, and organizing ministry. Testimonies to a deep work of grace found through Tilehurst are given by young people and sustained by an American chaplain who had been stationed in the locality, by Squadron Leader P. Blatherwick (who saw sixty young men and women received into the Methodist church there on one Sunday evening) and by the Rev. Colin A. Roberts.

Briefly, the method adopted was a long-period plan. First came a two years' visitation of the neighbourhood by minister and Sunday school teachers, with monthly People's Services: this from October 1939 to 1941. Then in October 1941 was launched a Crusade for Real Christianity where, at the end of eight days' meetings, seventy people registered their decision for Christ for the first time, whilst one hundred and twenty reaffirmed with renewed power their allegiance to Him. In April 1943 was inaugurated the New Life Movement to prepare for the Christian Commando Campaign held in Reading in June of that year. In January 1945 the full-scale use of Film became a means of reaching still more of the outsiders.

Throughout these years agencies have been formed to inspire and carry on the work. Foremost is the Young People's Prayer Fellowship. The Tilehurst Ambassadors for Christ number about forty and as a team seek to evangelize through testimony, preaching, song, and drama. Pew watchers ensure that no stranger visiting the church shall leave without a greeting, and receiving later a personal letter from the minister, a copy of the church journal, and an invitation to the activities of the church. With its own printing press, Tilehurst circulates each month far and near nine hundred copies of its magazine. Church Membership classes prepare juniors and older folk for discipleship and service in a course that is not rushed and may take as long as six months. The ideal of 'Jobs for All' is stressed and each new member is advised on some form of activity suited to his capacity and assisted in preparing for the work.

The Youth Centre, catering, as it does, for some 150 boys and girls, wins hearty praise in this book from the local authorities who also refer to its strong religious appeal.

This very simple and modest narrative should be set alongside of the Anglican *Towards the Conversion of England* (S.P.C.K., 1s.) and the Methodist *These Christian Commando Campaigns* (Epworth Press, 5s.) as a plain but moving assurance that the ideal can become, has become, actual — somewhere: why not everywhere?

* * * * *

FAMILY WORSHIP AND A MULTI-MILLIONAIRE. In his charming book, *I Planted Trees* (Lutterworth Press), Mr. Richard St. Barbe Baker (For. Dip. Cantab), late Assistant Conservator of Forests in Kenya Colony and the Southern Provinces of Nigeria) tells of his father who during the Evangelical revival of the 'eighties had been led to build a mission hall. To this hall by his invitation came such famous evangelists as General Booth, Lord Radstock, John Wood of the Evangelization Society, as well as

missionaries from many lands. The father was also an enthusiastic supporter of D. L. Moody, the American evangelist, and was one of the most active men on his committee when he was at Southampton.

When Richard Baker was only fourteen an unusual incident happened, which throws strong light on the influence of evangelism in the home, as well as on the craving for spiritual help in high places.

There had left England to seek her fortune in Canada a friend of his boyhood. She had passed out top of her year in a nursing examination. This enabled her to obtain a first-class appointment in Chicago, where she lived in state in a suite in the old Sharman House. One day she was telling her patient, who was in her care and recovering from a nervous breakdown, of her early days in a village at home, of Richard Baker's father and mother, and the simple life they led. She told of the morning and evening prayers, with the family gathered around. The multi-millionaire was astonished that any such life still existed in the world. He admitted that it might have been so years ago, but nowadays folk never thought of family prayers. 'Nurse,' he said, 'I'll make you a present of five thousand dollars if you can show me that it still happens.' He rang up his doctor, who agreed that he might take the trip to England. Five days later, he and the nurse, 'our friend Elizabeth', reached Southampton and turned up quite unexpectedly to tea at Richard Baker's home. His mother was delighted to welcome them and his father took the American round his nurseries and showed him trees that he had raised from Californian seed. After tea the father explained that it was his usual custom to have family prayers before they separated for the night: would the guest join them? Elizabeth had won her five thousand dollars. Out of it she made a present to Richard and his brother of ten pounds with which they bought a yacht and christened it *Elizabeth!*

W. E. FARNDALE

Recent Literature

John Wesley and William Law. By J. Brazier Green. (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

This volume is the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1945. It is a careful and competent study of an important influence in Wesley's life. There had been, up to now, rather a gap at this point in the detailed study of different aspects of his development. This volume satisfactorily fills the hiatus.

William Law was a great man and a great authority upon the spiritual life. He had a very considerable influence upon the Wesleys, and, as he said himself, he was to them for many years a kind of oracle. Then there came a deep and final breach between him and them. However much one admires Law's writings, and however frankly one admits the debt of early Methodism to him, it is impossible to read the whole story without feeling that Wesley was right in the dispute, both on practical and on doctrinal grounds, if the essence of the evangelical faith and the evangelical experience were to be safeguarded. It is satisfactory to find that Mr. Brazier Green deals so rationally with the general question of John Wesley's attitude to the mystics. There cannot be any doubt, in the minds of those who have really studied the issue, as to the reason for that attitude. On the one hand, John Wesley deliberately chose to translate the deeply mystical hymns of Scheffler and Tersteegen, and there is also, of course, a great deal of essential mysticism in the hymns of his brother Charles. Moreover, Wesley published for the reading of his people the works of many mystics, and among these a volume of extracts from Law's writings, and this as late as 1768. On the other hand, Wesley said hard things more than once about 'the mystic divines'. The reason is not far to seek. Wesley had good reason to dread Quietism after the experiences

of 1740 and 1741, and Mólther was not the only source of danger. William Law sometimes taught a perilous species of Quietism, as a reference to p. 155 of this volume is enough to show. Then, too, Law became more and more a devotee of Boehme, and Wesley had a well-warranted contempt for Boehme's more nonsensical writings, where his religious teaching (priceless as some of it is) was mixed up with the jargon of alchemy, and so forth. These things are quite enough to explain and excuse the loose condemnation of the mystics in which Wesley occasionally indulged.

There is much to commend in this volume, and little to criticize. It is rather a pity that Marjorie Bowen's absurd book should have been mentioned at all, for it has no claim whatever to be regarded as a serious study of the subject. Piette's study is given, as we think, a somewhat exaggerated importance, though, of course, the Belgian is right enough in his criticism of Tyerman's *gauche chronique*. Both these writers, as Mr. Brazier Green rightly remarks, were handling the scanty facts in the interests of an argument, though on opposite sides of the question. Mr. Brazier Green is to be congratulated on having dealt so satisfactorily with his subject.

HENRY BETT

The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England. By A. W. Harrison. (Epworth Press, 2s.)

The Fellowship of Believers. By Ernest A. Payne. (Kingsgate Press, 3s. 6d.)

Protestants and the Life of Today. By Raymond V. Holt. (Lindsey Press, 1s.)

These three books are concerned with the Protestant witness in the life and community of today. They are well written and authoritative. The first is the Wesley Historical Society Lecture recently given by the President of the Methodist Conference. In it he outlines the way in which John Wesley was compelled by the force of events to separate from the Anglican Church. That community was slack and decadent, especially in its work in America. The absence of parishes and bishops in that country forced the issue of ordination for the pioneers of Methodism in that country. Wesley believed that scripturally the difference between bishop and presbyter was not one of order but of function, and as the main task of Ashbury and Coke was 'oversight', naturally they became bishops. In Scotland the position so far as the Anglicans were concerned was much the same and resulted in a similar way, save that the term 'superintendent' was used in place of 'bishop'. In England the growth of a sense of churchmanship among the Methodist Societies, and a demand for the administration of the Sacraments by their own preachers, coupled with the intolerance of many Church of England vicars, led to ordination and separation. This frustrated Wesley's plan for his Societies to remain in the Church of England. Dr. Harrison outlines subsequent reactions on the part of the State and its Church, and shows that while co-operation has grown, the desire for reunion with the Church of England has receded. 'Our task', says Dr. Harrison, 'is to cultivate our own garden.'

The Fellowship of Believers is a statement of Baptist thought and practice yesterday and today. It is concerned with the Baptist attitude regarding the Church, its ministry and sacraments. It deplores the general slackness toward the doctrine of the Church and surveys the historical evidence both for the General and Particular Baptists. The early Baptists saw the visible Church in the local groups of believers who had fellowship with all Christians. The ministry for them was an individual responsibility, which later gained some corporate sense in the Baptist Union. Outside the local churches they recognize a missionary, teacher, and chaplain's ministry. As regards the sacraments, the validity of the Lord's Supper does not depend on the ordination of the celebrant, and Baptism is an adult confession of faith on the part of the individual believer. The Free Church Tradition embodied in the Baptist Church stresses the application of Christianity to the common life. Appendixes give

the Particular Baptist Confession of 1677, the Baptist reply to the Lambeth Appeal, and a list of modern books on the nature of the Church.

The third volume is the Dr. Williams Annual Lecture for 1944. It was delivered by the Principal of the Unitarian College at Manchester to students of the Presbyterian College at Carmarthen. The author urges that Protestants are responsible for individualism in every phase of the life of the community. While many regard the Reformation as a major disaster in human history, the author contends that where Nonconformity is powerful the individual conscience is most respected. The loss of the sense of the presence of God today is a challenge to Protestantism once more. Its original aim was a purer Christianity, though its limitations have marred its achievements. Certainly it gave a worthy place to the laity. As the author says: 'Today Christians have come to the parting of the ways. Our task in the Western World is to create a Christian Society, combining in it all that is good in Catholic and Protestant forms of Christianity, but passing beyond both.'

J. HENRY MARTIN

Introducing The New Testament. By Dr. A. M. Hunter. (S.C.M. Press, 6s.)

This is an example of Dr. Hunter's gift for writing short books on great subjects, books in which scholarship and lucidity are happily combined. It can be warmly recommended to any intelligent reader who wishes to know how to approach the New Testament, but feels that, while there are many books on the subject, most are too technical, or too long, or presuppose too much previous knowledge in the reader. Those, too, who have long been students of the New Testament and who are teachers and preachers, will find here illuminating judgements upon many of the questions involved, and will learn how never to lose the wood for the trees in their own expositions.

In the first part of the book Dr. Hunter begins with the question: 'Why do we study the New Testament?' After mentioning some of the less important reasons he answers that it is because 'it claims to be the record of a unique self-revelation of the living God on the stage of human history'. He then treats concisely and clearly of the language, text, and canon. Part II is concerned with the Four Gospels. Many readers will understand the Gospels better when they have read what Dr. Hunter has to say upon how they came to be written, and his short account of the Synoptic Problem. A chapter is then devoted to each of the four separately. Part III, on the Early Church and St. Paul, gives the reader the right approach to the Acts and to four of Paul's letters, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Philemon, and Philippians. Part IV, the Writings of the Apostolic Men, treats of Hebrews (the Epistle of Priesthood), James (the Epistle of Practice), 1 Peter (the Epistle of Hope), and 1 John (the Epistle of Life). There follows a chapter on Revelation (the Judgement and Victory of God). The Epilogue, on the Unity of the New Testament, is a summary of Dr. Hunter's valuable book with that title, and is a fitting conclusion of this study. It is easy to criticize a short bibliography, and to ask why was this or that omitted, but Dr. Hunter's bibliography is a discriminating selection and admirably suited for its purpose.

F. B. CLOGG

Orthodox Spirituality: An Outline of the Orthodox Ascetical and Mystical Tradition. By a Monk of the Eastern Church. (S.P.C.K., 5s.)

This is in many ways an attractive little volume. It shows a really catholic spirit throughout, and is frank in its recognition of the good that is found alike in the Church of Rome and in the Reformed Churches. The whole spirit and intention of the book are cirenical. But this means, unfortunately, that some things that would have to be challenged by every Protestant are passed over without comment and silently

approved — the Stylites, for example (who existed in Russia, we are told, down to the sixteenth century), and the adoration of the Virgin and the saints, and the veneration of ikons (though some defence of this last is attempted). The same is true also of the distinction between virtues acquired in the ascetical life and virtues 'infused' in the mystical life, which is, in effect, a sheer denial of the New Testament doctrine of grace. But, having entered this caveat, let us add that here is a very readable account of one large aspect of the Eastern Church, giving the English reader a conspectus, such as he would scarcely find anywhere else, of Orthodox devotion. One would have welcomed more information about movements that are specially Russian. The writer dismisses, as unorthodox, the teaching found in Merezhkovsky, which has remarkable links with the past, and represents a curiously persistent eschatological tendency. We should have liked to know more of this, and of a good many other developments, but it is impossible to be encyclopædic in a hundred pages. The little book is well worth reading, and it contains a large and really valuable bibliography. HENRY BETT

Many Creeds: One Cross. By Christopher E. Storrs. (S.C.M. Press, 6s.)

As the distances of the world keep on shrinking English Christians find themselves driven more and more into contact with non-Christian peoples. The war, the radio, and the cinema have brought the Far East near. As leisure returns and as men and women in the Forces recount their experiences on reaching home, they will describe the various religious practices they have observed and the question will again be asked: 'Are all religions at bottom one and the same?' In this excellent little book by Archdeacon Storrs of Western Australia, the S.C.M. has produced a review of the chief faiths of the world today. It brings out adroitly the distinctive contributions to human thought of the various great religions. Each one has emphasized some aspect of divine truth and has been followed by millions of adherents. The author writes with sympathy, warm from contacts with believers of various faiths. He is generous in his appreciation of the insight and range of non-Christian thought and devotion. But he finds that these, even at their best, fail to meet man's desperate need for illumination, succour, and redemption.

Hinduism is rich in mystical insight and includes great philosophies — 'But over all its history . . . there is written a demoralizing tolerance, a corrupting doctrine of the relativity of truth, which justifies even the most disquieting stages of belief and practice, finds a "Word of God" present at every level, and thereby saps all urgency and divine discontent.' Buddhism, after a brave struggle with the problem of suffering, leaves man to carry his own burden, does not face the fact of sin, and knows no resources of supernatural grace. The God of Islam 'is the majesty of the desert personified'. But man is not satisfied by recognizing that he is infinitely separated from a transcendent God. Turning to China and Japan the author says that we turn from the sons of Mary to the sons of Martha. The Chinese religion in various forms has given classic expression to humanism, eager for the dignity of man. But till the princely man, Jesus, has been seen, who shall know what is truly human? At the moment many readers will probably find the freshest interest in the chapter on 'Shinto and Mystical Nationalism', with its analysis of the strength and weakness of the religion of Japan. A great Christian has said: 'There are no comparative religions; Christianity is unique.' A feature of this fine little book is its demonstration that Christianity is more than a development and fulfilment of other faiths.

G. STANTON MARRIS

The Idea of Nature. By R. G. Collingwood. (Oxford Press, 15s.)

'When his "Essay on Philosophical Method" was passing through the Press in 1933 Collingwood remarked to a friend that, having propounded a theory of philosophical

method, he was now proceeding to apply it to a problem which had never been solved, namely, the Philosophy of Nature.' In this book, we are given, posthumously, his thesis, partly as he had written it for publication, and partly from other material which he had not been able completely to revise. There are three periods in which the idea of nature has been the main subject of reflection and become determinative for science. The ancient Greek view of nature as an intelligent organism was based on the analogy of the individual, who found in himself certain characteristics, and read them back into nature. The Renaissance view reflected the Christian idea of God as Creator and man's experience of designing and constructing machines. The modern view is evolutionary, following the analogy of history; for us, unlike the Greeks or men of the Renaissance period, true knowledge is not limited only to what is unchanging. Important consequences follow from the evolutionary view—change is no longer cyclical, as it was even with organic life for Aristotle, but progressive; Nature is no longer mechanical ('the conception of vital process . . . has come to stay'); teleology, which the mechanical view of nature had banished, is reintroduced; substance is now resolved into function ('just as in ethics you admittedly cannot separate what a man is from what he does . . . so in physics you cannot separate what matter is from what it does'). The historical survey in Parts I and II, from the Ionians, Pythagoreans, and Aristotle, up to Berkeley, Kant, and the transition in Hegel to the modern view, is, as one expects, masterly; incidentally, some misconceptions of the 'idealist' view to which even scholars have subscribed are firmly corrected. Like them, we could all take to heart the lesson of Collingwood's own 'logic of question and answer'; before one can claim to understand a man's answers, we must have grasped the questions he is asking himself (see his *Autobiography*, Pelican A 136). But even those who may feel that the earlier parts of this book take them out of their depth, stand to gain by Collingwood's exposition of modern physics in Part III, for, confessing himself a layman in these matters, he has successfully attempted to interpret for us the present view of the physical universe, which we all suspect as radically changing, without knowing how. There is no reversion 'to the old Greek view of nature as a living thing . . . we are welcoming a new view of physics which for the first time in modern history reveals a fundamental similarity, instead of an indefinite series of contrasts, between the world of matter and the world of life'. The book concludes with an estimate of Alexander and an appreciation of Whitehead. Especially in view of his final sentence one wishes that we could have had Collingwood's analysis and comment on 'the idea of Nature' in the Dialectical Materialists, for it is just here where they claim to have taken the question farther.

T. J. FOINETTE

Religion and the New Democracy. By Richard de Bary. (Simpkin Marshall, 5s.)

This is a book of inter-related papers, written at various times, to prove the necessity for what the writer calls an educational 'polis' for promoting the New Civic World Faith. He defines Civic religion as one of Faith, Hope, Charity, and Chivalry, and he claims that a belief in this is now burning brightly among Allied Peoples like a flame, and that it would accomplish its end by adopting American 'methods'. Perhaps the writer looks on the 'Allied World' through too roseate glasses, as he certainly looks on the people we call the enemy nations through glasses smudged by an unqualified and indiscriminating Imperialism. In the most original part of the book we read of the discovery of a New Social nerve-track, supposedly enshrined in each and all of us, which when collectivized will result in an all-ingathering-Ccommonwealth. Yet the book builds on the right foundation, even though it is something of a medley: 'Men have talked about peoples, development, and the advance and change of the world; but the only real change ever wrought in the world is the inner change

of hearts from unbrotherliness to brotherliness, and from disobedience to God's universe to the obedient life of humble fellowship with all things that are.' This fits in well with the main theme, the formation of a standard type of educational 'polis' as an instrument for starting upon a Democratic Cultural World Campaign. The writer's types are the method used by Greek expansionists in founding Culture in the cities of the East and America's Culture Campaign at the time of the American Union — though he acknowledges also the inspiration of the British Imperial model. During the war he found this model in a Divine Reality (in the guise of current events), which he calls our 'daily transcending educator'. He identifies our Democracy's Way of Life with lessons learned in our loyalty to the humane (the book was written before our discovery of the Atomic Bomb), and in the technique of a total world faith. The great lesson learned is one of Sovereignty — the lesson of how Demos is 'clothed upon' with a humane governing leadership and authority if it wishes to be a true Servant — Sovereign to lead Mankind. The writer's views of Empire and Empire building may be gathered from the fact that he places on a pinnacle of admiration men like Clive, Chatham, and Wellington. To be fair to the author, however, we must point out that in his chapter on a 'Finance Messiah' he tells us that he is not thinking of an individual, but of the Spirit or Genius to which individuals should conform. The writer's view of the place of Christ in the New Order is one to ponder. Very reverently he looks to Christ as the Architect of the New Day — not perhaps the Christ of our venerable creeds — but nevertheless Christ as Saviour and World Deliverer. The writer believes that without Him the World has no hope. He has hardly noted that the Christ of his faith is as far removed from the Christ of the Tennessee that he admires as from the Christ of the Society of Friends — or even of John Wesley. But, spite all animadversions, we cordially commend the book to the discriminating reader.

PERCY S. GARDEN

A Great Time to be Alive. By H. E. Fosdick. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

Though it is now well over forty years since Dr. Fosdick began his great ministry in America, this is emphatically a book for young men, whose faces are toward their own future and the future of their country and the world. These five and twenty sermons have all been preached under the storm and stress of war, and they all deal in Dr. Fosdick's well-known style both with the problems which the world-wide tragedy has already brought and the greater problems of what is yet to be upon the earth. No longer must the Church seek humbly to adjust Christ's Gospel to modern science. 'We have conquered the air only to be compelled to burrow under ground.' Our desperate need today, for the sake of our children's children, is to adjust our so-called 'civilization' to Him, and never Him to our 'civilization'. It is His Kingdom only that, both as nations and as men, we must seek first and foremost and all the time. Other refuge have we none, and we know it. This preacher's sternest words and warnings are addressed to his own country, with its race prejudice and isolationism. But we all of us have sinned and we must all begin again. And beneath the surface of the wars the greatest battle is ever being waged, the unseen personal battle of every man and woman. The strain on faith and hope and love was never greater than it is today. Shall we have 'this man to reign over us', or shall we not? If not, what is the alternative? In this war there are no neutrals. But thanks be to God who giveth us the Victory. — Such briefly is the message of these sermons. To read them, with their wealth of illustration and quotation, is not only a mental tonic and delight, but to those who will receive a message that is needed now more than ever, they will be a means of grace and lasting help.

THOS. H. BARRATT

Who Goes Home? By Jack Lawson. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

The old cliché 'Style is the man himself' finds justification in Mr. J. J. Lawson's collection of broadcasts and essays. There is a rugged grandeur in the 'sentences that are no sentences' and frequent passages of simple and affecting beauty. There is the Dickens touch (compare 'The Night Express' with Dickens's account of the stage-coach run to London) and 'The Shaftsman' vies with the tense and fascinating horror of Poe's *Pit and Pendulum*. But through it all there burns the zeal for social betterment, illuminated by reverence for God, and nature, and little children. Had Mr. Lawson deliberately set out to write another autobiography he could have produced no better account of the various influences which have helped to mould him, and we learn again and again what importance he assigns to those rough unlettered folk of a colliery village whose walk with God decided him for Christ. None can miss the fact, in his books or his life, that Jack Lawson is a follower of the Great Leader and has no desire to hide this. The result is that his book passes the test of all good writing — sincerity. It deals with varied phases of his life, particularly Parliament, and has interesting accounts of the origins of old customs and a description of that daily Secret Session, 'Prayers'. The book is aptly illustrated with particularly good photographs. An excellent Christmas present for — anyone!

T. HAROLD MALLINSON

Ideas Have Legs. By Peter Howard. (Frederick Muller, 7s. 6d.)

The story of the next twenty years in the making, says the wrapper of this colourful little book. It is also the story of the last twenty years or so, as lived by Peter Howard. Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the part which is autobiographical. It shows how a cynic of Fleet Street developed, through the aid of the Oxford Group Movement, into a sincere seeker after those things which the Fleet Street of his day was wont to regard as of little or no value. Howard was not really happy in Fleet Street, although through utter subservience to the ideas and whims of Lord Beaverbrook, he seems for a time to have earned a good living. The contacts he made there were full of fascination to one so anxious to 'get on'. He had little difficulty in adjusting himself to the ways of the 'Street of Ink', and its prizes came easily to such a one as he. In his own words: 'Success became an end in itself, instead of a means of righting the wrongs of the world. I was a part of that complacent, man-pleasing age which spent so much time telling itself the things it wanted to hear instead of the things it ought to hear.' Later he realized the utter selfishness of it all; this came home to him especially when, after some severe introspection, he saw himself as he really was — a man who would 'rather be a star on the losing side than blush unseen on a winning one'. Yet he was able to conceal from other people, and sometimes even from himself, the fact that he was more concerned with his own glory than with the fate of his side. There is a streak of egotism in many of us, and if we were honest maybe we should have to make a similar confession, even although, like Peter Howard, we have been quite sincere, at the time, when we have given addresses on 'playing for one's side'. Howard belonged to a generation brought up to believe that personal success was the chief aim of the individual, regardless of the fact that such an aim, pursued on a national scale, was the inevitable forerunner of catastrophe. His account of brushes with Beaverbrook, Churchill, and others is very interesting, for now his conscience was beginning to trouble him. The climax came when he met Frank Buchman, who taught him that there is no short cut to the New World, and that the one supreme need of man is to attune his life to the practice of seeking guidance from God. In *Moral Re-Armament* he found salvation; in the Oxford Group he came to himself. 'His chains fell off, His heart was free', and he began that process of spiritual surgery which resulted in the Peter Howard of today.

Naturally he holds Buchman in the highest esteem. He regards him as the supreme champion of Spiritual Values against the militant forces of Materialism — as the man who recognized that the old-style religious revival was inadequate to stand the shock of the new-style materialistic revolution, and that there is need for an adequate plan of life as well as a spirit of goodwill. Our author claims that Buchman has done for the best side of human nature what the materialist revolutionaries of the Left and the Right have done for the worst side of human nature. Well, while his claims for Buchman and the Oxford Group Movement are, to say the least, not modest, the Movement seems to have made a new man of Peter Howard. For him it was Buchman who took the ideas of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, of the guidance of God, and of the possibility of a change in human nature, which have existed in the world since 'men killed the carpenter's son', and gave them for our time an international strategy and framework in Moral Re-Armament. He 'gave these ideas legs', and they are on the march today. Summarized they are: 'When man listens, God speaks. When man obeys, God acts. When men change, nations change. World re-making and nation-changing come through life-changing.' Of course these ideas are not new. John Wesley gave them legs long before Buchman was heard of, and Paul before Wesley, and Jesus before Paul.

PERCY S. GARDEN

The School Without the Parson. By E. F. Braley. (Religious Education Press, 1s. 6d.)

In this book we have an opportune and useful publication. The title derives its significance from the provision in the new Education Act that religious instruction in the County (*né* Council) schools shall be given exclusively by the regular staff, the 'parson' (minister of any denomination) having no right or opportunity of entry either by front door or side. A retrograde step? A terrible calamity? By no means! For the first time an Act admits that Education, which many used to define exclusively in intellectual terms, and which has recently been concerned so largely with the body, working through school clinics and doctors, the feeding of necessitous children, and physical culture, *must*, if the whole personality is to be developed, include a definite course of religious training. Then why exclude the expert, the parson? Canon Braley is not alarmed. Speaking from a wide experience of schools and their staffs, his conviction is that we can trust the teachers, a body of people jealous of their own honour and reputation, to teach religion. The majority of them are connected (mostly as members) with Christian churches, and very many have passed their period of training in a Christian environment. But certain safeguards are necessary, and some of these the Act explicitly provides. The Church must be aware that it has a new responsibility, and the last chapters indicate lines along which the new situation may be met. In view of present changes Canon Braley would make a further valuable contribution to the solution of our educational problems if he would write a second booklet to stimulate and guide Sunday school teachers, whose work now, more than ever, demands both a fine intellectual equipment, and resource and earnestness. By his present booklet Dr. Braley will set many minds at ease, and give them a new hope for the future.

T. HAROLD MALLINSON

For Such a Time as This. By H. G. G. Herklots. (Lutterworth Press, 4s. 6d.)

Mr. Herklots, an Anglican priest, skilfully compresses the story of the ecumenical movement of the Christian Church. He stresses certain points — the Gospel has been rediscovered in age after age as ordinary folk by attractive living have shown that the Church of Christ has in it not only cold thought but passionate life; the old denominations cannot stand still; 'there is a real danger lest the Church of England,

while retaining the pretensions of a Church, should sink to the behaviour of a sect'; in a period of planning we must recognize how the missionary movements and heightened social consciousness of yesterday have opened a new vision of the worldwide Christian community of the future.

G. S. M.

The Night is Ending. By Norman N. G. Cope. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

The Fatherhood of God. By Evert J. Blokkink. (Eerdmans, Michigan, \$1.25.)

To the Uttermost. (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.)

Volumes of sermons are nowadays rarely marketable, but slender books of sermonettes, disguised as essays, are perhaps as effective and certainly more popular. The Epworth Press has discovered another Methodist preacher with a gift for passing on a message in an eminently attractive and readable form. One could wish that Mr. Cope had slightly pruned some sentences and that now and then his touch were a trifle lighter, but he may soon rank among our foremost religious essayists. *The Night is Ending* (incidentally there is a recent novel with this title) is the substance of addresses given to his London congregation against the background of bomb and blitz and battle-scars. He is a prophet of realistic insight and optimistic foresight and he has the right message for those who enter the peace fearful for the future. The theme that binds his addresses together is the necessity for getting one's values right. From the Scriptures and present-day events alike he enforces this necessity in every chapter. We shall look forward to another book from him, this time with the background of the peace.

The second book will appeal to those who are interested in verbal inspiration and tend towards Calvinistic (or Barthian) doctrine. The problem of the compatibility of the Divine Fatherhood with the existence of pain and suffering is squarely faced, but the author does not explain how that Fatherhood can consist with the eternal doom of God's wayward children. But he graciously concedes (p. 89) that 'we may believe that the children who die in infancy are saved.' The reader would often desire to know the sources of the many quotations, and footnotes (of which there are none) would be helpful, for the usefulness of such a book is largely increased when it sends a reader to original authorities.

The dainty cover of the third book suggests aright that it is a souvenir. Its array of names will bring many happy memories to the *habitués* of the Southport Convention, which recently celebrated its Diamond Jubilee. The contents are rather scrappy, perhaps of necessity. In the last two chapters, however, the Rev. J. Baines Atkinson deals with the heart and message of the Convention in a careful exposition of the vital doctrine of Christian Holiness.

T. H. M.

These Christian Commando Campaigns. Edited by Colin A. Roberts. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

This account of the Christian Commando Campaigns of the last few years makes most inspiring reading. One puts down the book with a feeling of profound thankfulness that the spirit of Methodism is still very much alive in our land, and that the much talked of 'Forward Movement' is now indeed on the march. Many writers combine to make this book one of the most significant religious documents of our time. Some of us who are now judged too old for such campaigns rejoice that the younger men are doing the things which gave us the greatest thrills when we were attempting similar work in the days immediately after the last war. We are not surprised to read that there is a real hunger for the things which really matter, nor are we either surprised or dismayed to find that in the experience of our modern crusaders conventional Christianity is far from adequate to the crying needs of today.

We welcome this movement, for we believe it to be of God. Its effect on our modern world are incalculable. Perhaps too its effect on the campaigners themselves will be of more value than many of the books they read on 'Evangelism'. Dr. Maldwyn Edwards's chapter on 'John Wesley and the Christian Commandos' is alone worth the price of the book, and, although to single out chapters when all are so good is invidious, we must mention the fine chapter by Dr. Eric Baker on 'The answers we give'. All the Ministers of our Church are much indebted to the Joseph Rank Benevolent Trusts for sending out so many free copies.

P. S. C.

In the *Harvard Theological Review* for July (*via* Milford, \$1) there is an article by Dr. C. C. McCown entitled 'In History or Beyond History'. It deals with the relation between history and eschatology. In one way it may be regarded as taking the side of Prof. Raven against Dr. Hildebrandt, though they don't seem to have been in the mind of the writer. He rejects the idea of transcendence, differing at this point from Archbishop Temple in *Nature, Man, and God*. Dr. McCown is entirely opposed to Reinhold Niebuhr's findings in his Gifford Lectures, and he is critical of Profs. C. H. Dodd and H. G. Wood. Barth and the Barthians are for him beyond the pale. While the article cannot be called convincing, it is very interesting and merits the attention of those whose minds are occupied with this pressing subject.

W. F. H.

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

Justice and the Social Order. By Emil Brunner. (Lutterworth Press, 15s.)

A book by Brunner is always notable. Here he has turned from theology proper to social doctrine, but readers who know his theology will see that it rules his social thinking, as it was sure to do. In this volume he only claims to have made a beginning with the social problems of today, but it is a good beginning. The book falls into two parts, one on 'Principles' and one on 'Practice'. While both are valuable, perhaps the first is the more so. There is also a long series of very penetrating 'Notes', largely on the findings of other writers.

The Rector of Zurich University defines 'justice' in these terms: 'Justice is the precept of the order of creation accommodated to concrete historical circumstance' (p. 186). This, of course, is to take the word in the old wide sense. It also shows that Brunner allows that there is an 'order of creation' apart from the Bible. The phrase defines his account of the 'order of nature'. As he says, the times demand that this medieval concept should be revived, examined, and defined. The 'racial' theory of human life propounded in Nazi Germany is just a false account of 'the order of nature'. For Brunner the true account of this ambiguous phrase depends upon the doctrine that God made man and in making him gave him certain rights, notably the right to freedom. This means that both totalitarianism and enforced communism cannot be Christian. On the other hand, Brunner points out again and again that democracy is not intrinsically Christian, nor will he allow that all other forms of government are necessarily wrong. Here his phrase 'accommodated to concrete historical circumstance' comes in, but we are not given any criterion by which the kind and degree of accommodation suited to particular historical situations are to be defined. Brunner cannot give the answer 'such kind and degree' as will best serve the purposes of the Kingdom of God (which, however vague, does show a line of approach), because he does not admit that the present social order has anything to do with the Kingdom. Here falls his absolute distinction between 'love' and 'justice'. The first may and does

begin to operate now, but not, for instance, in the realm of the State, since this belongs intrinsically to an *imperfect* social order. Indeed, Brunner has to say that even in the home a child has no *claim* to 'love' but only to 'justice', and he denies that the former has any place in the life of a nation. But may not a man love his country in a Christian way so long as this love, like the love of home, is only an element in the love of God — so long, that is, as it does not hinder but help the coming of the Kingdom? Brunner replies, of course, that for him the 'coming of the Kingdom' is not a matter for human enterprise, but for Divine intervention. He cannot allow that it may be both. Once or twice he suggests that in the New Testament God's intervention is to come by an Apocalypse and that the teaching there is not that 'things will get better' but that they will get worse. Yet even the Book of the Revelation does teach that there is to be a millennium of peace as well as outbreaks of woe. This is just one instance of the way in which Brunner tends to turn to the New Testament when it touches any social problem and to maintain that under that problem we have no need to study the 'order of creation'. There is another instance in his claim that the family has existed, much as it now is, 'from the beginning'. He will have nothing to do with the matriarchal idea and does not mention the claim of many anthropologists that man made many experiments with sex before the family emerged with any clearness. As to the Old Testament, he allows that it may be suggestive but it is not authoritative, not even under the Decalogue (as Luther claimed). Returning to Brunner's distinction between 'love' and 'justice', the reader should note that he makes a corresponding distinction between 'community' and 'society' — though, like others, he has no adequate definition of either (or of 'nation'). In the realm of justice his fundamental principle is *sum cuique*, which means that he leans to individualism. He does indeed speak of 'the rights of communities', as well as of individuals, but he neither defines the first nor relates them to the second. But it should be remembered that he only claims to be breaking ground in this book, not to be elaborating a complete system. His discussion of 'Principles' is 'full of meat'.

In the part of the book named 'Practice' Brunner follows in the main the same path as other Christian teachers who are turning their minds to this very urgent subject, yet he has many illuminating passages. He believes that it would be best if there were no Great Powers but only small ones. He adds, however, that small states may wisely federate, and this in different ways, but he holds that any true federation must spring from the free consent of its members. Yet surely the British Commonwealth of Nations, which he never names, follows this rule more absolutely than any other federation — and that Commonwealth is a *Great* Power. Once and again it is obvious that Brunner thinks that Switzerland is the nearest thing to a model State today, but would the Canton of Zug, for instance, be allowed to separate from the Swiss Confederation if it so wished? Again, while it is true that there was a civil war in the United States in the nineteenth century before the right of the central authority to over-ride that of any one State was secured, it is also true that there was a like civil war in the small country Switzerland. Again, Prof. Brunner thinks that the New Testament gives no guidance on international affairs, but surely Paul and Peter both admit, or even assert, that in their day an Empire was the best kind of government for the whole of their world. Here the appeal to the decision of the New Testament is lacking. It will be seen that the book stirs the mind, and this is a *sine qua non* in our present fearful dilemma. In the main too it points us in the right direction. The translation, by Mary Hottinger, is admirably done. One could wish for an index.

Church, Continuity and Unity. By H. Burn-Murdoch. (Cambridge Press, 1955.)

A large number of books and pamphlets about the Church, the Ministry and Sacraments, keep appearing from the 'right wing' of the Anglican Church. It is to be

regretted that the scholars of the 'left wing' leave the replies so largely to the Free Churches. Dr. Burn-Murdoch might perhaps be called 'right centre'. His book is chiefly a careful account of the relevant passages in the writings of the first two Christian centuries, beginning with the New Testament. He intersperses this with comments and expositions and references to current discussion. He divides his book into short chapters, each with its own topic, and he is careful in the use of terms. Probably he comes as near avoiding ambiguities as any writer on the subject, and he is as free from bias as it is possible to be in controversy. His book is clear and easy to follow. He quotes freely from the relevant literature, keeping mainly to the books of the last half century or so, but not omitting older books. He is punctilious about titles, but seems to know nothing of a certain 'Mr. Archibald W. Harrison' except that he wrote a book. His own volume was written in 1943 though it is only now published. In consequence his few references to the South India scheme are hardly up to date.

It is probably impossible to say much that has not already been said on the subject of the book. Dr. Burn-Murdoch treads a well-known path, but his book was well worth writing since it gives a kind of synopsis of the position today, though it is not synoptical in form. Against it it would be possible to marshal the usual array of disagreements, caveats, and queries. The writer, however, emphasizes a few points more than some other 'right wing' Anglican writers do. For instance, claiming that 'God is not tied to His sacraments — but we are', he stresses the idea that what is not 'essential' for Him may be so for us. But if God has given His blessings to the Christians of the Presbyterian Church, for instance, for a number of generations, in what sense can an episcopal Ministry be 'essential' to them? The writer seems to have confused 'essential' with 'obligatory' or 'authoritative', as indeed his quotations from Bishop Gore and Dr. Sparrow Simpson show, for they speak of 'authority'. The 'essential' admits no exceptions, but the 'obligatory' does. Then, of course, the question 'What is obligatory?' emerges. The writer does not directly mention the belief, now so widely held, that in the New Testament neither Christ nor the Apostles laid down any rule of Church organization for all times and places. Rightly distinguishing between 'organism' and 'organization', he claims that episcopacy is essential to the organism. Here, of course, he appeals to the history of the many centuries between A.D. 200 and the Reformation. About this history he uses the inexact word 'immemorial'. It becomes once more plain that the real appeal of the Anglo-Catholic is to the Nicene period. Before that he allows that there was a 'fluidity', to use Bishop Gore's word, about Canon and Creed and Ministry that has not been permissible since. Of course this too introduces a complex but familiar problem. Another of the points that Dr. Burn-Murdoch specially emphasizes is the idea of continuity. He makes comparatively little of the right of bishops to govern, and seems even to subordinate their right to be the arbiters of right doctrine to their function of maintaining the unity of the organism through the ages. He seems hardly to realize that there are Free Churchmen who also recognize the vital importance of historic continuity. The Declaration of the Methodist Conference on the Nature of the Church, for instance, say 'The Church cannot die'. Such Free Churchmen hold that the Holy Spirit has secured its continuity through the 'succession of the saints', and will secure it. Many other points might be mentioned and discussed. For instance, the writer does not make it quite clear, in his references to Baptism, whether he would say 'Once a Christian, always a Christian'. If so, are baptized Free Churchmen within the Church or not? But if a Free Churchman who can draw the line where fact passes to opinion (quite justifiably), wishes to know the present position of the controversy, stated by an opponent, without reading many books, this volume would help him well.

A Little Book of Baron von Hügel. Edited by P. Franklin Chambers. (Bles, 5s.)

This is a book of selections made for 'ordinary thoughtful men and women'. Von Hügel was a man of leisure who 'took time to be holy'. He shared his rich spiritual harvest with his friends, and now a growing number of seekers after truth eat at his table. He was catholic among Catholics, a philosopher who loved little children and homely things, and a sheltered cosmopolitan. Yet chief of all he was a layman whose 'office' was the cure of souls. These selections are divided under the headings 'Personal' (i.e. autobiographical), 'Philosophical', and 'Religious' — yet they are all religious. As Mr. Chambers, quoting another, says: 'He was a philosopher only in self-defence.' At the one crisis that broke into his quiet life he puzzled many as he still does. Perhaps Miss Petre's judgement, with which Mr. Chambers seems to agree, is the last word here: 'Tyrrell was much more a martyr than a saint, and von Hügel much more a saint than a martyr.' Readers to whom this is first taste of von Hügel will find that Mr. Chambers' discriminating 'Biographical Preface' is much more than its title promises. It provides the necessary background for the understanding of the selections themselves. It is not easy to read von Hügel, for his style of writing is often complex and sometimes tortuous, but how many have found it worth while to understand!

Glorious Company. By Cecil Northcott. (Livingstone Press, 5s.)

The London Missionary Society was founded on 21st September 1795 at a gathering at the 'Castle and Falcon' Inn in Aldersgate Street. It is therefore keeping its third jubilee. Mr. Northcott was set the task of telling the story of a hundred and fifty years in 50,000 words, and he has fulfilled it admirably. He gives unity to his volume by making the idea of 'the emergence of the Church' his guide. This means, of course, that references to such heroes as Moffat and Livingstone in Africa, Morrison and Griffith John of China, Gilmour of Mongolia, Williams of Erromanga, and Lawes of New Guinea, are scattered here and there, but we none the less get some idea of their stature. Mr. Northcott has made a wise arrangement of his material, for today it is not the adventures of pioneers that bulks most largely in the story of Missions but the coming of indigenous churches. The book is far from being a mere digest. Here, for instance, are three vivid touches from a single page — the church in Samoa has been so prolific of preachers that there are unemployed ministers, called 'resting pastors'; in Papua the Society had to deal with peoples whose arithmetic amounted to the trinity 'one, two, many'; a 'student' declared 'God's not a Papuan, God's not a Chinaman, God's not a Japanese, but God is an Englishman ten feet high'! The story of the martyrdoms of Madagascar, of course, is one of the most glorious of Missionary stories. But 'the time would fail me to tell'! It is possible to know a great deal of the story of the Missions of one's own Church and to be ignorant of all others, but a wise gardener will sometimes look over the fence at his neighbour's garden. The first name of the L.M.S. was just 'the Missionary Society' and it invited offers of service from all who would undertake to preach the Gospel, but from the first its chief supporters have been the Congregational Churches. The Methodist will be interested to see how the differences between the 'independent' and 'connexional' ways of looking at the Church have influenced Missionary policy. This book is an effective record of the ways of Christian courage in three continents.

From Virgil to Milton. By C. M. Bowra. (Macmillan, 15s.)

In this book Prof. Bowra describes four great epic poems. The first is Virgil, who set a new pattern in epic. The other three are Camões, Tasso, and Milton, who followed the Virgilian pattern, each according to his own genius. In an introductory chapter Prof. Bowra makes a clear distinction between the oral epic, of which the

Iliad and Beowulf are examples, and the literary epic, of which the four poets of his book were masters. Epics of the first class were originally spoken and were meant for the rapid attention of *hearers* — and they were necessarily spoken in parts; the Aeneid and its followers, on the other hand, were written from the first and were meant for *readers* who could take time to flavour a phrase or study the purposes of a long poem. It is to these purposes that Prof. Bowra chiefly calls our attention, and not to such things as the beauties of the language, which for the most part he takes for granted. In his chapter on Virgil, which is perhaps his best, he shows, for instance, how the poet, living at the end of a great epoch, set himself by long preparation to write a poem that should embody its spirit at its noblest; how he sought to do this by telling a story that should portray this spirit chiefly in a hero and his exploits; how he felt that, whatever intrusions he allowed to his fancy in this episode or that, he should none the less root the story in history; how he felt that he must show that the gods or 'higher powers' intended and decided the course of history; how he meant to commend the spirit of the past to his readers; how, none the less, he suffered from a foreboding that the past was past; and so on. Prof. Bowra has certainly succeeded in showing that Aeneas is a less disappointing hero than many have thought him. It is interesting to compare his findings with T. R. Glover's and to note that in the main they are the same.

In his other chapters Prof. Bowra tries to show that in the points named above the other three poets, each with his own *differentia*, quite intentionally followed Virgil's lead — Camões depicting the glory of Portugal in her great 'hour', Tasso illustrating the splendour of the Crusader at his best, and Milton taking the wider subject of 'the ways of God', not to one race or one enterprise, but 'to man' in all space and all time. It is with Milton that the comparison is least close. For instance, our author does his best to make Adam into a hero, but who could present him as a hero who succeeded? Yet on the whole Prof. Bowra achieves his purpose. The four poems are alike in many ways, and do belong to one great distinguishable class. To one reader Professor Bowra has not made it clear whether he would deny the name 'literary epic' to all poems that fall outside this class. What about Dante? He cannot be said, for example, to have a hero, but was he not an epic poet? This, however, is a minor point. English readers who know no Portuguese or Italian will be specially grateful for Professor Bowra's chapters on Camões and Tasso. He writes for them as well as others, for he is good enough to give English renderings of his quotations. His book is a masterly study of the architectonics of the epic. Not the least interesting passage is the one that shows how Milton delineates Satan's descent from his 'throne of royal state' to a reptile's crawl.

Essays by Divers Hands. Edited by Gordon Bottomley. (Milford, 8s. 6d.)

Here are the eight forty-five-minute lectures of the Royal Society of Literature for 1942. They make a pleasant posy, which the editor ties neatly together with the string 'Humanism'. This, indeed, is the subject of the first lecture. It is by Dr. H. V. Routh. For him humanism is the source of our civilization, not the cause of its chaos, and he has a plea for the marriage of 'letters' and science. Two of the later lectures are little more than a series of annotated examples — the one of letters and the other of legends — but the letters are those of Erasmus and his English friends and the legends belong to Byzantine art. A cynic might say that the former are exercises in eulogy. Mr. Geoffrey Tillotson weighs Matthew Arnold in the latter's own scales with admirable skill. In 'The Sleeping Beauty' Sir Stephen Gaselee traces an amorous conceit through the byways of poetry, and under 'The Player and his Art' Sir John Martin-Harvey tells us something of the psychology of acting. All art, of course, eludes final analysis, but a preacher might well ponder this essay, not least in its insistence that a good actor, however long a play may run, never merely repeats himself. Sir John tells some good

stories. The two remaining essays are the best in a good bunch. Mr. G. R. Hamilton succeeds perhaps as nearly as may be in distinguishing between 'Verse and Poetry'. His discrimination is deft and delicate. Finally, Mr. De la Mare has an essay on the value of the 'Quiet Life' to a reader who knows how to read. As one would expect, there is fine writing here and apt allusion. The essay, too, mounts as it progresses. Its writer shows how a true reader's life is as 'nectar' compared with the 'treacle' of what is vulgarly called 'life'.

English Public Schools. By Rex Warner. (Collins, 4s. 6d.)

This volume in the 'Britain in Pictures' series has eight coloured plates and thirty illustrations in black-and-white. The reader is left to connect them with the letter-press for himself, but they are well-chosen, especially the thirty. The writer traces the history of the Public Schools from William of Wykeham to the present, dividing his record into periods that might have been called 'Origins', 'The Period of Atrophy', 'Arnold and his Contemporaries', 'The Period of Complacency and Multiplication', and 'The Present Position'. Mr. Warner is not a research-worker but an exponent, and he does his business well. There is here a due mixture of praise and blame, period by period. For instance, the author shows how the idea that religion is the primary element in education has waxed in the periods of progress and waned in the rest. Again, in silent protest against Lytton Strachey's 'de-bunking', he counts Arnold the greatest of English schoolmasters. He shows too that the present demand that these schools should be 'public' in the true sense is nothing else but a claim that the rich shall at long last restore to the poor a privilege that they have filched from them for centuries. There are many interesting details — for instance, Mr. Warner shows that there are old-established day-schools among the Public Schools; he gives figures to show that the over-weighting of numbers in classes long obtained in these schools, making the 'rule of the rod' almost inevitable; he tells us how and why competitive examinations were introduced and organized games. Perhaps he might have said more about the Reformation when dealing with Colet and his imitators, and he might have mentioned both Wesley's protest at Kingswood in 'the period of apathy' and the part that the Free Churches have taken in the founding of new schools in the last century. But he does succeed in doing justice to this characteristic English institution and rightly maintains that there is that in it that ought to survive.

India and the Indian Ocean. By K. M. Panikkar. (Allen & Unwin, 6s.)

Years ago Professor Otto said to me: 'The British Empire will survive, but its capital will be at Bombay.' This book recalls the remark but lacks its extravagance. It claims that India cannot be safe nor can her commerce thrive without the control of the Indian Ocean. The writer appeals both to geography and history. He has little difficulty in showing that the fate of a peninsula like India is inevitably bound up with the fate of the ocean into which it thrusts. Most of his book tells, with care and thoroughness, the *history* of the Indian Ocean for more than two thousand years. Broadly speaking, it falls into three periods — a long period of Indian supremacy, especially in the Eastern half of the ocean, a period when the Arabs rather crossed than 'ruled the waves', and the period of European domination. Here and there a detail may be questioned — for instance, the author confuses the Assyrians with the Babylonians; he assumes that Prince Henry the Navigator himself took the sea; and he writes that the European war of today spread 'imperceptively' to the Pacific — but one can only admire the scope of his reading and the skill with which he marshals his facts. He demurs to the usual estimate of Da Gama and Dupleix, but does full justice to Albuquerque (whom he counts the greatest of the Europeans in the long story) and De Suffren. His whole survey leads up to a warning that in the future India will not

be able comfortably to take it for granted that the British fleet will keep her safe from invasion by sea as it has done for more than a hundred years. Looking far ahead, as he rightly does, Mr. Panikkar foresees that China or Japan or the United States may threaten from the Pacific or Russia from the Persian Gulf. He sees no solution but a 'regional' control of the Indian Ocean by England, India, Australia, and South Africa, acting together within the British Commonwealth of Nations. This regional group would be one of four for the whole Commonwealth, the four falling under a 'Supreme Council'. Here is an Indian writer who shows no *animus* against the West, and it would be well if the leaders of the Indian Congress and the Moslem League would heed his argument. (Incidentally he claims that *ahimsa* is not a Hindu doctrine.) Not the least interesting of the results of his historical survey is the disproof of the old idea that the Indian has never 'taken to the sea'. On the contrary, in the first period named he learnt to cross the ocean direct both east and west, and in the third he made sallies from the small inlets of the south-western coast that put Britain on her mettle. What a flurry there was in Bombay, for instance, when the Angria, whom we have no right to label 'pirate', held Colaba! There are a good many misprints in the book — for instance, 'charted' for 'un-charted' on page 39, and 'Stafford' for 'Stamford' on page 70 — and one could wish that the sources of the six excellent reproductions of historical pictures that close the book had all been given, but here is the kind of book that we need in this period of 'global' thought. But does not the writer come too near assuming that 'power politics' are still to rule history? If every great nation is to claim to dominate a huge area of the sea, even in self-defence, what is to happen where the areas over-lap?

The Baltic Nations. By F. W. Peck. (Boreas Publishing Co., 7s. 6d.)

The nations dealt with in this book are the almost forgotten peoples of Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Dr. Peck traces their story from the medieval days when they first clearly emerged in history, showing their likenesses and differences. This is well done, though Königsberg means 'King's hill', not 'Kingsborough', and it was not named by a Prussian ruler but a Polish. Some will think Dr. Peck's syntax slipshod at times, and surely 'Eirann' is to be preferred to 'Eirish'. 'Unpracticable' (p. 125) is, no doubt, one of a few misprints. But about two-thirds of the book is given to the last thirty years, for Dr. Peck is an advocate as well as an historian. Here the details are so numerous and the complex situation changes so often that one might think one were trying to solve a cross-word puzzle whose squares keep on moving. Yet Dr. Peck's is the right method, for in dealing with Eastern Europe especially we don't need broad generalization but that fact be added to fact, name to name, and date to date. The book is largely an arraignment of Russia, and those who are not ready to face the unpalatable part of the truth about the U.S.S.R. should not read it. Incidentally the 'other side' of the truth about Poland is also plain. Of course one asks the question 'What is the cure?' It is not part of Dr. Peck's purpose to explore the answer, but he continually appeals to the principle of 'the self-determination of nations', to which the Allies, including Russia, have pledged themselves. His book is an excellent, even a poignant, example of the difficulties of applying this principle. How big must a 'national' group be before it has the right to self-determination? Is there any place in the world now for any small nation unless its independence be guaranteed either by a Great Power or some such international authority as was envisaged at San Francisco? Does not this mean a limitation of its right to do anything it likes? Is there any chance that Russia will let go her hold on these three 'Baltic nations'? Can she not plead 'military necessity', as, for instance, President Truman does when he demands bases on islands in the Pacific? Is there then nothing for it but a useless and irritating protest? The whole problem is likely to be raised, for the 'Baltic Forest

Brothers', who work 'under-ground', are very much alive. Perhaps the best hope is that Russia will soon discern that three contented little allies, living under her guarantee, will be of better service to her than three discontented little 'republics' within the U.S.S.R.

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

The United Society for Christian Literature has added two more numbers to its 'Africa's Own Library' — *A King for Africa*, by G. E. F. Laing, and *The Gold Coast — Akan*, by J. B. Danquah (Lutterworth Press, 1s. 6d., each). Those who wish to see West Africa through African eyes should keep an eye on this series. . . . Dr. Newton Flew has written a foreword to a pamphlet by a Chaplain in the R.A.F., Rev. J. H. Winn Haswell, entitled *Target for a New Tomorrow* (Epworth Press, 1s.). It is 'a plea from the heart' on behalf of men returning from the Services to civilian life, but this is supplemented by 'a practical plan'. Its note is urgency, and it is written with the vividness that the subject demands. . . . *The Circuit Rider*, by J. E. Eagles (Epworth Press, 1s.), is a play about the greatest Methodist after John Wesley, Francis Asbury. It will teach English Methodists something about American Methodism — of which most of them are just ignorant. As Asbury was born in 1745, this play is peculiarly timely. . . . Rev. P. Addison Devis has published two children's dramatic Services with the Epworth Press, *The Tale of a Loaf* (3d.), and *Flowers tell their own Stories* (4d.). While they specially suit Harvest Festivals, there is no reason why they should be 'cornered' in the autumn. . . . The title of *Situations Vacant*, the new number in 'The World-Parish Broadcasts' (Epworth Press, 6d.), is Dr. Maldyn Edwards's paraphrase of 'the labourers are few'. His message is a welcome variant on the frequent 'words to the weary' of religious broadcasts. . . . Messrs. Paul Elek (Hatton Garden, E.C.1.) send us *Front-Line Airline*, by E. Bennett-Bremner (5s. 6d.); which tells the story of air-transport from Karachi to Australia and beyond during the war, and Bernard H. Cox's *Prefabricated Homes* (2s.), which shows 'how it is done'. There are both diagrams and pictures. . . . Colin Ley was a saint early, for he died at eighteen. Yet he had explored the Christian doctrine of Happiness, and put the results into a small manuscript that passed from hand to hand among his friends. Here it is for a wider public under the title *What Makes Happiness?* The key to the booklet is 'What makes life dreary is want of motive' (T. S. Eliot). Shebbear School may well rejoice in this 'old boy'. Is the book mawkish? No, it is as healthy as a healthy lad. (Epworth Press, 1s.). . . . The Rev. G. B. Middleton (The Manse, Hingham, Norwich) has written a searching and stimulating pamphlet on *Village Methodism*. The writer has himself faced the difficult problems with which he deals. He will supply copies of this 'tract for the times' gratis, but would welcome any gift to meet expenses. . . . In *The Jig-Saw Family* (Epworth Press, 6d.) Tutor Norman Snaith shows that he understands home as well as Hebrew. There isn't a single 'theoretical' word in these six Early Morning Broadcasts. One, for instance, is on 'Family Jokes'. The very book for people who have just discovered that marriage is not all honey. . . . Here are four pamphlets from The Friends' Book Centre (Euston Road, W.C.1). One, *Membership in the Society of Friends*, by Horace B. Pointing (6d.), deals with the principles and practice of a Society that does not demand from its members adherence to any formal creed — that is, it tells us what things are 'commonly received' among Quakers. It shows that there may be unity of spirit without uniformity of 'letter'. A four-page leaflet on *Essential Christianity* (2d.) tells of 'three short sentences' that 'came to' William E. Wilson. To Methodists they may well recall Wesley's 'Rules for the Societies', both in what they say and what they leave un-said. In *Health and the Quaker Way of Life* (6d.) Howard E. Collier shows how, not for the first time, Christian practice anticipated scientific discovery — in this case

the discovery that psychology and religion have much to do with physical health. In the fourth pamphlet, *The Appeal of Quakerism to the Non-Mystic* (6d.), William Littleboy argues, in effect, that every true Christian, whether he knows it or not, is a 'mystic' in the true sense, for is not religion fellowship with God? This is a very careful, well-informed, and up-to-date piece of work.

ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The following contractions are used: *B.R.L.* for *Bulletin of Rylands Library* (Manchester University Press, 2s. 6d.); *C.Q.* for *Congregational Quarterly* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.); *E.T.* for *The Expository Times* (T. & T. Clark, 1s.); *H.T.R.* for *Harvard Theological Review* (Harvard University, via Milford, \$1); *I.R.M.* for *International Review of Missions* (Milford, 3s.); *J.R.* for *Journal of Religion* (University of Chicago, via Cambridge, \$1.25); *M.W.* for *The Moslem World* (Hartford Seminary, via Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 2s.); *P.* for *The Presbyter* (J. Clarke, 1s.); *S.P.* for *Studies in Philology* (University of North Carolina, \$1.25); *Y.R.* for *Yale Review* (Yale University, via Milford, \$1). Where the title of an article does not sufficiently denote its subject, the latter is prefixed in brackets.

(Bible) 'A School for Translators', by Edwin W. Smith (*I.R.M.*, July); 'Marriage Problems in Tanganyika', by B. G. M. Sundkler (*I.R.M.*, July); 'Missionary Training, "One World", an Implication for', by C. Murray Rogers (*I.R.M.*, July); 'Medical College, Vellore, The Union Christian', by J. C. McGilvray (*I.R.M.*, July); 'New Order—Ruin and Rebuilding, The', by John Foster (*E.T.*, Aug.); 'Kierkegaardian Doctrine of "the Moment", The Christian Doctrine of Hope and the', by T. H. Croxall (*E.T.*, Aug.); 'Garvie, Dr. Alfred E.', by H. Wheeler Robinson (*C.Q.*, July); (Women, Equality of) 'Beauty and the Beast', by Helen J. Rollas (*C.Q.*, July); 'National Religion, Foundations for', by Hugh P. Ramage (*C.Q.*, July); 'Population Problem, The Christian Church and the', by J. S. Hoyland (*C.Q.*, July); 'More and Erasmus for a New Social Order, Designs by', by R. P. Adams (*S.P.*, April); 'Paradise Lost, The Motivation of Satan's Rebellion in', by Arnold Williams (*S.P.*, April); 'Patriarchian Sonneteers and Neo-Platonic Love; The', by P. N. Siegel (*S.P.*, April); 'Europe, The Rehabilitation of', by Alvin Johnson (*Y.R.*, June); (Linguistics) 'Foreign Language Teaching', by Leonard Bloomfield (*Y.R.*, June); 'Shakespeare as a Symbolist Poet', by Cleanth Brooks (*Y.R.*, June); 'Alaska, Colonists for', by William Gilman (*Y.R.*, June); 'Theology Today, The Prospect for Ecumenical', by Wilhelm Pauck (*J.R.*, April); 'Law of Nature, The', by J. Luther Adams (*J.R.*, April); 'Paul and the Primitive Church', by S. MacLean Gilmour (*J.R.*, April); 'Hitler and Israel, or On Prayer', by E. Rosenstock-Huussy (*J.R.*, April); 'Mot and Al eyan Baal, Myth of', by V. and J. R. Jacobs (*H.T.R.*, April); 'New England, Religious Enthusiasm and Separatism in Colonial', by E. W. Armstrong (*H.T.R.*, April); 'Layman's Complaint and the Friar's Answer, The', by F. Lee Utley (*H.T.R.*, April); 'Congregationalism and the Future', by Some Congregationalists (*P.*, July); (Law of Nature), 'Theonomic Thinking', by W. A. Whitehouse (*P.*, July); 'Oecumenical Theology, There is an', by H. P. Ehrenberg (*P.*, July); 'Training for the Ministry, Some Remarks on', by J. A. Whyte and W. B. Johnston (*P.*, July); 'Jonah, A Berlin Codex of', by Herbert C. Youtie (*H.T.V.*, July); 'Quadrato Lapidı Comparatur, Vir Bonus', by Arnold Ehrhardt (*H.T.V.*, July); 'Cassino, A.D. 529-1944, Monte', by Dom Romanus Rios (*B.R.L.*, July); 'Aramaic Gospels, Reconstruction of the', by David Daube (*B.R.L.*, July); 'Laud, in Commemoration of Archbishop', by J. R. H. Moorman (*B.R.L.*, July); 'Pentateuch Problem, Some New Aspects of the', by Edward Robinson (*B.R.L.*, July); 'Arabic Transmission of Greek Thought to Medieval Europe', by R. Walzer (*B.R.L.*, July); 'Culture-Pattern Theory, Psychological Implications of the', by T. H. Pear (*B.R.L.*, July).

WILL YOU NAME A COT?

One of the most beautiful ways of perpetuating the memory of a relative or friend is to name a cot in the National Children's Home.

The donor of £30 or more decides the Branch of the Home at which the cot is placed and the name by which it will be known.

Full details as to procedure will be sent gladly if application is made to the Principal. Please mention *London Quarterly* when writing.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

CHIEF OFFICES: Highbury Park, London, N.5

THE SECOND ADVENT

The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine

T. FRANCIS GLASSON, M.A., D.D.

In this book the subject of the Second Advent (or Parousia) is developed in four parts: (1) The Parousia in Jewish Literature extant in the time of Jesus; (2) In the teaching of Jesus; (3) In the Early Church; and (4) In Jewish writings of the Christian era.

The enthralling problems of eschatology are of great importance and in the last few generations have been keenly debated. One vital element is here traced to its source. The new theory which finally emerges in Part Three has a surprising flood of light to throw upon many passages of the New Testament. Though embodying much original research, the argument is presented in a form that will appeal to the general reader as well as to all who would make a serious study of the Christian message and the life of our Lord. This is a scholarly and well-written book.

12s. 6d.

FROM ALL BOOKSELLERS

LONDON: THE EPWORTH PRESS

LUTTERWORTH

Recent Theological Publications

THE DEVIL AND GOD

WILLIAM ROBINSON, D.D.

'Enlivened by humour . . . interesting, vivid and provocative. The book is rich in suggestions; it is certain to arouse much discussion, and it ought to be an incentive to renewed Bible Study and rededication of life. Excellent value for money both for its form and its content' — *Christian Advocate* 49s. net

INTERPRETERS OF MAN

GWILYM O. GRIFFITH

'Wide learning and sympathetic intelligence' — *Times and Tide*.

'This valuable work has given us short sketches of eighteen teachers (including Hegel, Mazzini, Nietzsche, Newman, Tolstoy) . . . the chapters are remarkable for their grasp of essentials' — *Christian* 19s. net

THIS IS THE MESSAGE

FRANZ HILDEBRANDT, Ph.D.

A Continental reply to Charles Raven's book. 'He does not spare his antagonist, and he is an adept at detecting the weak spots in Dr. Raven's armour. He drives home any advantage relentlessly, but he never loses his infectious good humour' — *Church Times* 4s. 6d. net

THE WORD AS TRUTH

ALAN M. FAIRWEATHER

'Every sign of thorough knowledge of the sources over a wide field, and none of superficial or hasty writing' — *Life and Work*. 'An uncommonly able, penetrating, and incisive book' — *British Weekly* (LUTTERWORTH LIBRARY) 10s. 6d. net

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLICAL REVELATION

by

Hubert Cunliffe-Jones

7s. 6d. net

James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 5 Wardrobe Place, London, E.C.4

